arXiv:1207.5188v1 [math.DS] 21 Jul 2012

LAWS OF RARE EVENTS FOR DETERMINISTIC AND RANDOM DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

HALE AYTAÇ, JORGE MILHAZES FREITAS, AND SANDRO VAIENTI

Abstract. The object of this paper is twofold. From one side we study the dichotomy, in terms of the Extremal Index of the possible Extreme Value Laws, when the rare events are centred around periodic or non periodic points. Then we build a general theory of Extreme Value Laws for randomly perturbed dynamical systems. Decay of correlations against L^1 observables will play a central role in our investigations.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Statement of Results 4
3. Extremal Index dichotomy for deterministic systems 12
3.1. Decay against L^1 implies exponential EVL at non-periodic points 12
3.2. The dichotomy for specific systems 14
3.3. The Extremal Index at discontinuity points 17
4. Extremes for random dynamics 22
4.1. Laws of rare events for random dynamics 22
4.2. Laws of rare events for specific randomly perturbed systems 26
5. Extremes for random dynamics from a spectral approach 32

Date: July 24, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A50, 60G70, 37B20, 60G10, 37A25, 37H99.

Key words and phrases. Random dynamical systems, Extreme Values, Hitting Times Statistics, Extremal Index.

HA was partially supported by FCT (Portugal) grant SFRH/BD/33371/2008. JMF was partially supported by FCT grant SFRH/BPD/66040/2009 and by FCT project PTDC/MAT/099493/2008. HA and JMF were supported by the European Regional Development Fund through the programme COMPETE and by the Portuguese Government through the FCT and CMUP under the project PEst-C/MAT/UI0144/2011. All three authors were supported by FCT project PTDC/MAT/120346/2010, which is financed by national and European Community structural funds through the programs FEDER and COMPETE. SV was supported by the CNRS-PEPS *Mathematical Methods of Climate Theory* and by the ANR-Project *Perturbations*.

5.1. The setting 32
5.2. Limiting distributions 35
5.3. Cheking assumptions (A1)-(A4) 36
5.4. Extremal index 40
Acknowledgements 44
References 44

1. Introduction

Deterministic discrete dynamical systems are often used to model physical phenomena. In many situations, inevitable observation errors make it more realistic to consider random dynamics, where the mathematical model is adjusted by adding random noise to the iterative process in order to account for these practical imprecisions. The behaviour of such random systems has been studied thoroughly in the last decades. We mention, for example, [K86a, KL06] for excellent expositions on the subject.

Laws of rare events for chaotic (deterministic) dynamical systems have also been exhaustively studied in the last years. This type of results appeared first as referring to as Hitting Times Statistics (HTS) or Return Times Statistics (RTS). In this setting, rare events correspond to entrances in small regions of the phase space and the goal is to prove distributional limiting laws for the normalised waiting times before hitting/returning to these asymptotically small sets. We refer to [S09] for an excellent review. More recently, rare events have also been studied through Extreme Value Laws (EVLs), *i.e.*, the distributional limit of the partial maxima of stochastic processes arising from such chaotic systems simply by evaluating an observable function along the orbits of the system. Very recently, in [FFT10, FFT11], the two perspectives have been proved to be linked so that, under general conditions on the observable functions, the existence of HTS/RTS is equivalent to the existence of EVLs. These observable functions achieve a maximum (possibly ∞) at some chosen point ζ in the phase space so that the rare event of occurring an exceedance of an high level corresponds to an entrance in a small ball around ζ.

Surprisingly, not much is known about rare events for random dynamical systems. One of the main goals here is to establish what we think to be the first result proving the existence of HTS/RTS, and equivalently EVLs, for randomly perturbed dynamical systems. Part of the difficulty in establishing that type of result derives from the fact that it is not immediately clear how to define the existence of HTS/RTS for random dynamics. On the other hand, from the EVL perspective, it is quite straightforward to define it even when we have to deal with randomly perturbed systems. We exploit this fact and the connection between EVLs and HTS/RTS in order to settle the concepts.

We remark that in the recent paper [MR11] the authors defined the meaning of first hitting/return time in the random dynamical setting. Up to our knowledge this was the first paper to address this issue of recurrence for random dynamics.

In general terms, we will consider uniformly expanding and piecewise expanding maps. Then we randomly perturb these discrete systems with additive, independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) noise introduced at each iteration. The noise distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to (w.r.t.) Lebesgue measure. The details will be given in Section 2.

The main ingredients will be decay of correlations against all L^1 observables (we mean decay of correlations of all observables in some Banach space against all observables in L^1, which will be made more precise in Definition 2.2 below) and the notion of first return time from a set to itself.

We realised that the techniques we were using to study the random scenario also allowed us to give an answer to one of the questions raised in [FFT10a]. In this paper, it was studied the connection between periodicity, clustering of rare events and the Extremal Index (EI). In certain situations, like when rare events are defined as entrances in balls around (repelling) periodic points, the stochastic processes generated by the dynamics present clustering of rare events. The EI is a parameter $\vartheta \in [0,1]$ which quantifies the intensity of the clustering. In fact, in most situations the average cluster size is just $1/\vartheta$. No clustering means that $\vartheta = 1$ and strong clustering means that ϑ is close to 0. In [FFT10a, Section 6], it is shown that for uniformly expanding maps of the circle, like $f : \mathcal{S}^1 \to \mathcal{S}^1$ with $f(z) = z^2$, there is a dichotomy in terms of the possible EVL: either the rare events are centred at (repelling) periodic points and then $\vartheta < 1$ or at non periodic points and the EI is 1. This was proved for cylinders, in the sense that rare events corresponded to entrances into dynamically defined cylinders (instead of balls) and one of the questions it raised was if this dichotomy could be proved more generally for balls and for more general systems.

One of our results here, Theorem A, allows to prove the dichotomy for balls and for systems with decay of correlations against L^1 which include, for example, piecewise expanding maps of the interval like Rychlik maps (Proposition 3.2). We consider for centres, ζ's, both points of continuity and discontinuity of the map (Proposition 3.4).

In the course of writing this paper we came across a paper by Keller, [K12], where, through the use of a powerful technique developed in [KL09], based on an eigenvalue perturbation formula, it is proved the dichotomy at continuity points of expanding maps with a spectral gap for its Perron-Frobenius operator (which also include Rychlik maps, for example). Our approach here is different since we use an EVL kind of argument and our assumptions are based on decay of correlations against L^1 observables. Moreover, as mentioned above, we also consider the cases where the centres of rare events, ζ's, are discontinuity points of the map.

We remark that in most situations, decay of correlations against L^1 observables is a consequence of the existence of a gap in the spectrum of the map's corresponding Perron-Frobenius operator. However, in [D98], Dolgopyat proves exponential decay of correlations for certain Axiom A flows but along the way he proves it for semiflows against L^1 observables. This is done via estimates on families of twisted transfer operators for the Poincaré map, but without considering the Perron-Frobenius operator for the flow itself. This means that the discretisation of this flow by using a time 1 map, for example, provides us an example of a system with decay of correlations against L^1 for which it is not known if there exists a spectral gap of the corresponding Perron-Frobenius operator. Moreover, as we point out in Remark 3.1, we do not actually need decay of correlations against L^1 in its full strength.

Apparently, the existence of a spectral gap for the map's Perron-Frobenius operator, defined in some nice function space, implies decay of correlations against L^1 observables. However, the latter is still a very strong property. In fact, from decay of correlations against L^1 observables, regardless of the rate, as long as it is summable, one can actually show that the system has exponential decay of correlations of Hölder observables against L^∞. See [AFL11, Theorem B]. So an interesting question is:

Question. *If a system presents summable decay of correlations against L^1 observables, is there a spectral gap for the system's Perron-Frobenius operator, defined in some appropriate function space?*

Returning to the random setting, our main result asserts that the dichotomy observed for deterministic systems vanishes and regardless of the centre ζ being a periodic point or not, we always get standard exponential EVLs and, equivalently, standard exponential HTS/RTS (which means that $\vartheta = 1$). This will be proved in Section 4 using an EVL approach with decay of correlations against L^1 as our main assumption.

Still in the random setting, motivated by the work of Keller, [K12], in Section 5, we prove basically the same result as before but based on the spectral approach used by Keller to study deterministic systems. As a byproduct we get an HTS/RTS formula with sharp error terms for random dynamical systems (see Proposition 5.1).

2. Statement of Results

Consider a discrete time dynamical system $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}, T)$ which will denote two different but interrelated settings throughout the paper. $\mathcal{X}$ is a topological space, $\mathcal{B}$ is the Borel σ-algebra, $T : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ is a measurable map and $\mathbb{P}$ is a T-invariant probability measure, *i.e.*, $\mathbb{P}(T^{-1}(B)) = \mathbb{P}(B)$, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Also, given any $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, let $\mathbb{P}_A$ denote the conditional measure on $A \in \mathcal{B}$, *i.e.*, $\mathbb{P}_A := \frac{\mathbb{P}|_A}{\mathbb{P}(A)}$.

Firstly, it will denote a deterministic setting where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M}$ is a compact Riemannian manifold, $\mathcal{B}$ is the Borel σ-algebra, $T = f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a piecewise differentiable map and $\mathbb{P} = \mu$ is an f-invariant probability measure. Let $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote a Riemannian metric on $\mathcal{M}$ and Leb a normalized volume form on the Borel sets of $\mathcal{M}$ that we call Lebesgue measure.

Secondly, it will denote a random setting which is constructed from the deterministic system via perturbing the original map with random additive noise. We assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a quotient of a Banach vector space $\mathcal{V}$, like $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. In the case $d = 1$, we will also denote the circle $\mathbb{T}^1$ by $\mathcal{S}^1$. Let $\operatorname{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the induced usual quotient metric on $\mathcal{M}$ and Leb a normalised volume form on the Borel sets of $\mathcal{M}$ that we call Lebesgue measure. Also denote the ball of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ around $x \in \mathcal{M}$ by $B_\varepsilon(x) := \{y \in \mathcal{M} : \operatorname{dist}(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$. Consider the unperturbed deterministic system $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$. For some $\varepsilon > 0$, let θ_ε be a probability measure defined on the Borel subsets of $B_\varepsilon(0)$, such that

$$\theta_\varepsilon = g_\varepsilon \mathrm{Leb} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \underline{g_\varepsilon} \leq g_\varepsilon \leq \overline{g_\varepsilon} < \infty \tag{2.1}$$

For each $\omega \in B_\varepsilon(0)$, we define the additive perturbation of f that we denote by f_ω as the map $f_\omega : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$, given by [1]

$$f_\omega(x) = f(x) + \omega. \tag{2.2}$$

Consider a sequence of i.i.d. random variables (r.v.) $W_1, W_2, \ldots$ taking values on $B_\varepsilon(0)$ with common distribution given by θ_ε. Let $\Omega = B_\varepsilon(0)^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the space of realisations of such process and $\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ the product measure defined on its Borel subsets. Given a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and the realisation of the stochastic process $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots) \in \Omega$, we define the random orbit of x as $x, f_{\underline{\omega}}(x), f^2_{\underline{\omega}}(x), \ldots$ where, the evolution of x, up to time $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is obtained by the concatenation of the respective additive randomly perturbed maps in the following way:

$$f^n_{\underline{\omega}}(x) = f_{\omega_n} \circ f_{\omega_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1}(x), \tag{2.3}$$

with $f^0_{\underline{\omega}}$ being the identity map on $\mathcal{M}$. Next definition gives a notion that plays the role of invariance in the deterministic setting.

Definition 2.1. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we say that the probability measure μ_ε on the Borel subsets of $\mathcal{M}$ is stationary if

$$\iint \phi(f_\omega(x))\, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon(x)\, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega) = \int \phi(x)\, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon(x),$$

for every $\phi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ integrable w.r.t. μ_ε.

---

[1] In the general theory of randomly perturbed dynamical systems one could consider perturbations other than the additive ones and distributions θ_ε which are not necessarily absolutely continuous. Our choice is motivated by the fact that our main result for the extreme values in presence of noise could be relatively easily showed with those assumptions, but it is also clear from the proof where possible generalizations could occur. We were especially concerned in constructing the framework and in finding the good assumptions for the theory, which is surely satisfied for more general perturbations and probability distributions. Let us notice that other authors basically used additive noise when they studied statistical properties of random dynamical systems [BBM02, BBM03, AA03], for instance.

The previous equality could also be written as

$$\int \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon = \int \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon$$

where the operator $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon : L^\infty \to L^\infty$ (L^∞ to be intended w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure), is defined as $(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \phi)(x) = \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} \phi(f_\omega(x)) \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon$ and it is called the *random evolution operator*. The adjoint of this operator is called the *random Perron-Frobenius operator*, $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon : L^1 \to L^1$ (L^1 is to be intended w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure), and it acts by duality as

$$\int \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \psi \cdot \phi \, \mathrm{dLeb} = \int \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \phi \cdot \psi \, \mathrm{dLeb}$$

where $\psi \in L^1$ and $\phi \in L^\infty$.
It is immediate from this definition to get another useful representation of this operator, namely

$$\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} \mathcal{P}_\omega(x) \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega),$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\omega$ is the Perron-Frobenius operator associated to f_ω.
We recall that the stationary measure μ_ε is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure and with density h_ε if and only if such a density is a fixed point of the random Perron-Frobenius operator: $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon$ [2]

We can give a deterministic representation of this random setting using the following skew product transformation:

$$\begin{array}{rccc} S: & \mathcal{M} \times \Omega & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \times \Omega \\ & (x, \underline{\omega}) & \longmapsto & (f_{\omega_1}, \sigma(\underline{\omega})), \end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

where $\sigma : \Omega \to \Omega$ is the one-sided shift $\sigma(\underline{\omega}) = \sigma(\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots) = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \ldots)$. We remark that μ_ε is stationary if and only if the product measure $\mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ is an S-invariant measure.

Hence, the random evolution can fit the original model $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}, T)$ by taking the product space $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M} \times \Omega$, with the corresponding product Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$, where the product measure $\mathbb{P} = \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\epsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ is defined. The system is then given by the skew product map $T = S$.

For systems we will consider, $\mathbb{P}$ has very good mixing properties, which in loose terms means that the system loses memory quite fast. In order to quantify the memory loss we look at the system's rates of decay of correlations w.r.t. $\mathbb{P}$.

Definition 2.2 (Decay of correlations)**.** Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ denote Banach spaces of real valued measurable functions defined on $\mathcal{X}$. We denote the *correlation* of non-zero functions $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_2$ w.r.t. a measure $\mathbb{P}$ as

$$\mathrm{Cor}_{\mathbb{P}}(\phi, \psi, n) := \frac{1}{\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{C}_1} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_2}} \left| \int \phi \, (\psi \circ T^n) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} - \int \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} \int \psi \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P} \right|.$$

---

[2] The duality explains why we take $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ acting on L^1 and $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ on L^∞. Moreover our stationary measures will be absolutely continuous with density given by the fixed point of the Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$.

We say that we have *decay of correlations*, w.r.t. the measure $\mathbb{P}$, for observables in $\mathcal{C}_1$ *against* observables in $\mathcal{C}_2$ if, for every $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and every $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_2$ we have

$$\operatorname{Cor}_{\mathbb{P}}(\phi, \psi, n) \to 0, \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

In random setting, we will only be interested in Banach spaces of functions that do not depend on $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$, hence, we assume that ϕ, ψ are actually functions defined on $\mathcal{M}$ and the correlation between these two observables can be written more simply as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Cor}_{\mathbb{P}}(\phi, \psi, n) := & \frac{1}{\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{C}_1} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_2}} \left| \int \left(\int \psi \circ f_{\underline{\omega}}^n \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \right) \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon - \int \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \int \psi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \right| \\ = & \frac{1}{\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{C}_1} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_2}} \left| \int \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^n \psi \cdot \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon - \int \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \int \psi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \right| \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^n \psi)(x) = \int \cdots \int \psi(f_{\omega_n} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1} x) \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega_n) \ldots \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega_1) = \int \psi \circ f_{\underline{\omega}}^n(x) \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We say that we have *decay of correlations against L^1 observables* whenever we have decay of correlations, with respect to the measure $\mathbb{P}$, for observables in $\mathcal{C}_1$ against observables in $\mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = L^1(\text{Leb})$ is the space of Leb-integrable functions on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_2} = \|\psi\|_1 = \int |\psi| \, \mathrm{dLeb}$. Note that when μ, μ_ε are absolutely continuous with respect to Leb and the respective Radon-Nikodym derivatives are bounded above and below by positive constants, then $L^1(\text{Leb}) = L^1(\mu) = L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)$.

The goal is to study the statistical properties of such systems regarding the occurrence of rare events. There are two approaches for this purpose which were recently proved to be equivalent.

We first turn to the existence of an EVL for the partial maximum of observations made along the time evolution of the system. To be more precise consider the time series $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ arising from such a system simply by evaluating a given random variable (r.v.) $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ along the orbits of the system:

$$X_n = \varphi \circ f^n, \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.6}$$

Note that when we consider the random dynamics, the process will be

$$X_n = \varphi \circ f_{\underline{\omega}}^n, \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.7}$$

which can also be written as $X_n = \bar{\varphi} \circ S^n$, where

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \bar{\varphi} : & \mathcal{M} \times \Omega & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \\ & (x, \underline{\omega}) & \longmapsto & \varphi(x) \end{array}, \tag{2.8}$$

Clearly, $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ defined in this way is not an independent sequence. However, invariance of μ and stationarity of μ_ε guarantee that the stochastic process is stationary in both cases.

We assume that φ achieves a global maximum at $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}$, for every $u < \varphi(\zeta)$ but sufficiently close to $\varphi(\zeta)$, the event $\{x \in \mathcal{M} : \ \varphi(x) > u\} = \{X_0 > u\}$ corresponds to a topological ball "centred" at ζ and, for every sequence $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $u_n \to \varphi(\zeta)$, as $n\to\infty$, the sequence of balls $\{U_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$U_n := \{X_0 > u_n\} \tag{2.9}$$

is a nested sequence of sets such that

$$\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n = \{\zeta\}. \tag{2.10}$$

In what follows, an *exceedance* of the level $u\in\mathbb{R}$ at time $j\in\mathbb{N}$ means that the event $\{X_j > u\}$ occurs. We denote by F the distribution function (d.f.) of X_0, *i.e.*, $F(x) = \mathbb{P}(X_0 \le x)$. Given any d.f. G, let $\bar{G} = 1 - G$ and u_G denote the right endpoint of the d.f. G, *i.e.*, $u_G = \sup\{x : G(x) < 1\}$.

The idea then is to consider the extremal behaviour of the system for which we define a new sequence of random variables $M_1, M_2, \ldots$ given by

$$M_n = \max\{X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}\}. \tag{2.11}$$

Definition 2.3. We say that we have an *EVL* for M_n if there is a non-degenerate d.f. $H : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ with $H(0) = 0$ and, for every $\tau > 0$, there exists a sequence of levels $u_n = u_n(\tau)$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$n\,\mathbb{P}(X_0 > u_n) \to \tau, \quad \text{as } n\to\infty, \tag{2.12}$$

and for which the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \le u_n) \to \bar{H}(\tau), \quad \text{as } n\to\infty. \tag{2.13}$$

Remark 2.1. We remark that one of the advantages of the EVL approach for the study of rare events for random dynamics is that its definition follows straightforwardly from the deterministic case. In fact, the only difference is that for random dynamical systems, the r.v. M_n's are defined on $\mathcal{M}\times\Omega$ where we use the measure $\mathbb{P} = \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ as opposed to the deterministic case where the ambient space is $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mu$.

The motivation for using a normalising sequence u_n satisfying (2.12) comes from the case when $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ are independent and identically distributed. In this i.i.d. setting, it is clear that $\mathbb{P}(M_n \le u) = (F(u))^n$. Hence, condition (2.12) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \le u_n) = (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_0 > u_n))^n \sim \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right)^n \to \mathrm{e}^{-\tau},$$

as $n\to\infty$. Moreover, the reciprocal is also true. Note that in this case $H(\tau) = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$ is the standard exponential d.f.

When $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ are not independent, the standard exponential law still applies under some conditions on the dependence structure. These conditions are the following:

Condition $(D_2(u_n))$**.** We say that $D_2(u_n)$ holds for the sequence $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ if for all ℓ, t and n

$$|\mathbb{P}\left(X_0 > u_n \cap \max\{X_t, \ldots, X_{t+\ell-1} \le u_n\}\right) - \mathbb{P}(X_0 > u_n)\mathbb{P}(M_\ell \le u_n)| \le \gamma(n,t),$$

where $\gamma(n,t)$ is decreasing in t for each n and $n\gamma(n,t_n) \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$ for some sequence $t_n = o(n)$.

Now, let $(k_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of integers such that

$$k_n \to \infty \quad \text{and} \quad k_n t_n = o(n). \tag{2.14}$$

Condition $(D'(u_n))$**.** We say that $D'(u_n)$ holds for the sequence $X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots$ if there exists a sequence $\{k_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (2.14) and such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(X_0 > u_n, X_j > u_n) = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

By [FF08a, Theorem 1], if conditions $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$ hold for $X_0, X_1, \dots$ then there exists an EVL for M_n and $H(\tau) = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$. Besides, as it can be seen in [FF08a, Section 2] condition $D_2(u_n)$ follows immediately if $X_0, X_1, \dots$ is given by (2.6) and the system has sufficiently fast decay of correlations.

Now, we turn to the other approach which regards the existence of HTS and RTS. In the deterministic case, consider a set $A \in \mathcal{B}$. We define a function that we refer to as *first hitting time function* to A and denote by $r_A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ where

$$r_A(x) = \min\left\{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\} : \ f^j(x) \in A\right\}.$$

The restriction of r_A to A is called the *first return time function* to A. We define the *first return time* to A, which we denote by $R(A)$, as the minimum of the return time function to A, *i.e.*,

$$R(A) = \min_{x\in A} r_A(x).$$

In the random case, we have to a make choice regarding the type of definition we want to play the roles of the first hitting/return times (functions). Essentially, there are two possibilities. The *quenched* perspective which consists in fixing a realisation $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$ and define the objects in the same way as in the deterministic case. The *annealed* perspective consists in defining the same objects by averaging over all possible realisations $\underline{\omega}$. Here, we will use the quenched perspective to define hitting/return times because it will facilitate the the connection between EVLs and HTS/RTS in the random setting. (We refer to [MR11] for more details on both perspectives)

For some $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$ fixed, some $x \in I$ and $A \subset I$ measurable, we may define the *first random hitting time*

$$r_A^{\underline{\omega}}(x) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : \ f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(x) \in A\}$$

and the *first random return* from A to A as

$$R^{\underline{\omega}}(A) = \min\{r_A^{\underline{\omega}}(x) : \ x \in A\}.$$

Definition 2.4. Given a sequence of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, so that $\mathbb{P}(V_n)\to 0$, the system has (random) *HTS* G for $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ if for all $t\geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(r_{V_n}\leq \frac{t}{\mathbb{P}(V_n)}\right)\to G(t) \text{ as } n\to\infty, \tag{2.16}$$

and the system has (random) *RTS* $\tilde{G}$ for $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ if for all $t\geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{V_n}\left(r_{V_n}\leq \frac{t}{\mathbb{P}(V_n)}\right)\to \tilde{G}(t) \text{ as } n\to\infty. \tag{2.17}$$

In the deterministic case, $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{M}$, $\mathbb{P}=\mu$ and $T=f$. In the random case, $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{M}\times\Omega$, $\mathbb{P}=\mu_\varepsilon\times\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$, $T=S$ defined in (2.4), $V_n=V_n^*\times\Omega$, where $V_n^*\subset\mathcal{M}$ and $\mu_\varepsilon(V_n^*)\to 0$, as $n\to\infty$.

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(r_{V_n}\leq \frac{t}{\mathbb{P}(V_n)}\right)=\mu_\varepsilon\times\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}\left(r^{\omega}_{V_n^*}\leq \frac{t}{\mu_\varepsilon(V_n^*)}\right).$$

The normalising sequences to obtain HTS/RTS, are motivated by Kac's Lemma, which states that the expected value of r_A w.r.t. μ_A is $\int_A r_A\,d\mu_A=1/\mu(A)$. So in studying the fluctuations of r_A on A, the relevant normalising factor should be $1/\mu(A)$.

The existence of exponential HTS is equivalent to the existence of exponential RTS. In fact, according to the Main Theorem in [HLV05], a system has HTS G if and only if it has RTS $\tilde{G}$ and

$$G(t)=\int_0^t(1-\tilde{G}(s))\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{2.18}$$

In [FFT10], the link between HTS/RTS (for balls) and EVLs of stochastic processes given by (2.6) was established for invariant measures μ absolutely continuous w.r.t. Leb. Essentially, it was proved that if such time series have an EVL H then the system has HTS H for balls "centred" at ζ and vice versa. Recall that having HTS H is equivalent to say that the system has RTS $\tilde{H}$, where H and $\tilde{H}$ are related by (2.18). This was based on the elementary observation that for stochastic processes given by (2.6) we have:

$$\{M_n\leq u\}=\{r_{\{X_0>u\}}>n\}. \tag{2.19}$$

This connection was exploited to prove EVLs using tools from HTS/RTS and the other way around. In [FFT11], we carried the connection further to include more general measures, which, in particular, allows us to obtain the connection in the random setting. To check that we just need to use the skew product map to look at the random setting as a deterministic system and take the observable $\bar{\varphi}:\mathcal{M}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ defined as in (2.8) with $\varphi:\mathcal{M}\to\mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ as in [FFT11, equation (4.1)]. Then Theorems 1 and 2 from [FFT11] guarantee that if we have an EVL, in the sense that (2.13) holds for some df H, then we have HTS for sequences $\{V_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $V_n=B_{\delta_n}\times\Omega$ and $\delta_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, with $G=H$ and vice-versa.

Next, we give an abstract result, in the deterministic setting, that allows to check conditions $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$ for any stochastic process $X_0, X_1, \dots$ arising from a system which has decay of correlations against L^1 observables. As a consequence of this result in Section 3, more precisely in Propositions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, we will obtain the announced dichotomy for the EI based on the periodicity of the point ζ.

Theorem A. *Consider a dynamical system $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mu, f)$ for which there exists a Banach space $\mathcal{C}$ of real valued functions such that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\psi \in L^1(\mu)$,*

$$Cor_\mu(\phi,\, \psi, n) \le Cn^{-2}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of both ϕ, ψ. For any point ζ, consider that $X_0, X_1, \dots$ is defined as in (2.6), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. Set $R_n := R(U_n)$.

If there exists $C' > 0$ such that for all n we have $\mathbf{1}_{U_n} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{\mathcal{C}} \le C'$ and $R_n \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$, then conditions $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$ hold for $X_0, X_1, \dots$. This means that there is an EVL for M_n defined in (2.11) and $H(\tau) = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$.

In light of the connection between EVLs and HTS/RTS it follows immediately:

Corollary B. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem* A *we have HTS/RTS for balls around ζ with $G(t) = \tilde{G}(t) = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{t}$.*

Remark 2.2. Note that condition $R_n \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$ is easily verified if the map is continuous at the points of the orbit of ζ. We will state this formally in Lemma 3.1.

Remark 2.3. Observe that decay of correlations as in (2.20) against $L^1(\mu)$ observables is a very strong property. In fact, regardless of the rate (in this case n^{-2}), as long as it is summable, one can actually show that the system has exponential decay of correlations of Hölder observables against $L^\infty(\mu)$. See [AFL11, Theorem B].

Now, we give an abstract result in the random setting which enables to conclude that by adding random noise, regardless of the point ζ chosen, we always get an EI equal to 1.

Theorem C. *Consider a dynamical system $(\mathcal{M} \times \Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}, S)$, where $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{T}^d$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a deterministic system which is randomly perturbed as in (2.2) with noise distribution given by (2.1) and S is the skew product map defined in (2.4). Assume that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $dist(f(x), f(y)) \le \eta dist(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$. Assume also that the stationary measure μ_ε is such that $\mu_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon \mathrm{Leb}$, with $0 < \underline{h}_\varepsilon \le h_\varepsilon \le \overline{h}_\varepsilon < \infty$. Suppose that there exists a Banach space $\mathcal{C}$ of real valued functions defined on $\mathcal{M}$ such that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\psi \in L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)$,*

$$Cor_{\mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}}(\phi,\, \psi, n) \le Cn^{-2}, \tag{2.21}$$

where $Cor_{\mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}}(\cdot)$ is defined as in (2.5) and $C > 0$ is a constant independent of both ϕ, ψ.

For any point $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \dots$ is defined as in (2.7), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. If there exists

$C'>0$ such that for all n we have $\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\in\mathcal{C}$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq C'$, then the stochastic process $X_0,X_1,\ldots$ satisfies $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$, which implies that we have an EVL for M_n such that $\bar{H}(\tau)=\mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$.

Again, using the connection between EVLs and HTS/RTS we get

Corollary D. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem* C *we have exponential HTS/RTS for balls around ζ, in the sense that* (2.16) *and* (2.17) *hold with $G(t)=\tilde{G}(t)=1-\mathrm{e}^{t}$ and $V_n=B_{\delta_n}(\zeta)\times\Omega$, where $\delta_n\to 0$, as $n\to\infty$.*

Remark 2.4. We remark that we do not need to consider that $\mathcal{M}$ is a d dimensional torus in order to apply the theory. Basically, we only need that $f_\omega(\mathcal{M})\subset\mathcal{M}$, for all $\omega\in B_\varepsilon(0)$. As we will see more carefully in Section 4, for example, piecewise expanding maps of the interval, with finitely many branches, satisfy all the conclusions of Theorem C .

3. Extremal Index dichotomy for deterministic systems

In this section we will start by proving Theorem A and a simple lemma asserting that continuity is enough to guarantee that $R_n\to\infty$.

Next, we give examples of systems to which we can apply Theorem A in order to prove a dichotomy regarding the existence of an EI equal to 1 or less than 1, depending on whether ζ is non-periodic or periodic, respectively. This will be done for uniformly expanding and piecewise expanding maps, when all points in the orbit of ζ are continuity points of the map.

In the third subsection, we will consider Rychlik maps, which are piecewise expanding maps of the interval, and will analyse the EI also in the cases when the orbit of ζ hits a discontinuity point of the map.

3.1. **Decay against L^1 implies exponential EVL at non-periodic points.**

Proof of Theorem A. As explained in [FF08a, Section 2], condition $D_2(u_n)$ is designed to follow easily from decay of correlations. In fact, if we choose $\phi=\mathbf{1}_{U_n}$ and $\psi=\mathbf{1}_{\{M_\ell\leq u_n\}}$ we have that we can take $\gamma(n,t)=C^*t^{-2}$, where $C^*=CC'$. Hence, condition $D_2(u_n)$ is trivially satisfied for the sequence $(t_n)_n$ given by $t_n=n^{2/3}$, for example.

Now, we turn to condition $D'(u_n)$. Taking $\psi=\phi=\mathbf{1}_{U_n}$ in (2.20) and since $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq C'$ we easily get

$$\mu\left(U_n\cap f^{-j}(U_n)\right)\leq(\mu(U_n))^2+C\left\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}}\left\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\right\|_{L^1(\mu)}j^{-2}\leq(\mu(U_n))^2+C^*\mu(U_n)j^{-2}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $C^* = CC' > 0$. By definition of R_n, estimate (3.1) and since $n\mu(U_n) \to \tau$ as $n \to \infty$ it follows that for there exists some constant $D > 0$ such that

$$n \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n \rfloor} \mu(U_n \cap f^{-j}(U_n)) = n \sum_{j=R_n}^{\lfloor n/k_n \rfloor} \mu(U_n \cap f^{-j}(U_n)) \leq n \lfloor \tfrac{n}{k_n} \rfloor \mu(U_n)^2 + n\, C^* \mu(U_n) \sum_{j=R_n}^{\lfloor n/k_n \rfloor} j^{-2}$$

$$\leq \frac{(n\mu(U_n))^2}{k_n} + n\, C^* \mu(U_n) \sum_{j=R_n}^{\infty} j^{-2} \leq D \left(\frac{\tau^2}{k_n} + \tau \sum_{j=R_n}^{\infty} j^{-2} \right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

□

Remark 3.1. In the above demonstration it is important to use L^1-norm to obtain the factor $\mu(U_n)$ in the right parcel of the last term in (3.1), which is crucial to kill off the n factor coming from the definition of $D'(u_n)$. However, note that we actually do not need decay of correlations against L^1 in its full strength, which means that it holds for all L^1 functions. In fact, in order to prove $D'(u_n)$ we only need it to hold for the functions $\mathbf{1}_{U_n}$.

Also, note that we do not need such a strong statement regarding the decay of correlations of the system in order to prove $D_2(u_n)$. In particular, even if $\mathbf{1}_{U_n} \notin \mathcal{C}$ (as when $\mathcal{C}$ is the space of Hölder continuous functions), we can proceed as in [C01, Lemma 3.3] or [FFT10, Lemma 6.1], where condition $D_2(u_n)$ is still verified by using a suitable Hölder approximation.

According to Theorem A, in general terms, if the system has decay of correlations against L^1 observables, then to prove $D'(u_n)$ one has basically to show that $R_n \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$. Next lemma gives us a sufficient condition for that to happen.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that ζ is not a periodic point and that f is continuous at every point of the orbit of ζ, namely $\zeta, f(\zeta), f^2(\zeta), \ldots$, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n = \infty$, *where R_n is as in Theorem* A.

Proof. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We will show that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large $R_n > j$. Let $\epsilon = \min_{i=1,\ldots,j} \operatorname{dist}(f^i(\zeta), \zeta)$ and let

$$U = \bigcap_{i=0}^{j} f^{-i}\big(B_{\epsilon/2}(f^i(\zeta))\big),$$

where $B_{\epsilon/2}(f^i(\zeta))$ denotes the ball of radius $\epsilon/2$ around $f^i(\zeta)$. By continuity of f at $f^i(\zeta)$, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U_n \subset U$ for all $n \geq N$. But then by definition of ϵ and U we must have that $f^i(U_n) \cap U_n = \emptyset$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, j$ which implies that $R_n > j$. □

Remark 3.2. Note that if ζ is a periodic point of prime period p then clearly, regardless of how large n is, $R_n = p$. However, for periodic points, as explained in [FFT10a], if they are repelling then we can still get a limit law with $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$, for an EI $0 < \vartheta < 1$, if some conditions on the long and short term dependence structure of the process hold.

In general terms, the analysis is done as before except for the fact that the role of the balls U_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, is replaced by that of the annuli $A_n = U_n \setminus f^{-p}(U_n)$. In particular, the dependence conditions to be verified, called $D^p(u_n)$ and $D'_p(u_n)$, are just obtained from conditions $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$ by replacing U_n by A_n. Hence, if we replace the conditions of Theorem A on U_n by similar ones on A_n, instead, then the conclusion will be that conditions $D^p(u_n)$ and $D'_p(u_n)$ hold. This is proved in [FFT10a, Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 2]. Besides, in [FFT10a, Proposition 2] it is shown that for repelling periodic points $\lim_{n\to\infty} R(A_n) = \infty$.

3.2. **The dichotomy for specific systems.**

One of the results in [FFT10a] is that for uniformly expanding systems like the doubling map, there is a dichotomy in terms of the type of laws of rare events that one gets at every possible centre ζ. Namely, it was shown that either ζ is non-periodic, in which case, you always get a standard exponential EVL/HTS, or ζ is a periodic (repelling) point, in which case you obtain an exponential law with an EI $0 < \vartheta < 1$ given by the expansion rate at ζ (see [FFT10a, Section 6]). This was proved for cylinders rather than balls, meaning that the sets U_n are dynamically defined cylinders (see [FFT10a, Section 5] or [FFT11, Section 5], for details). Results for cylinders are weaker than the ones for balls, since, in rough terms, it means that the limit is only obtained for certain subsequences of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ rather than for the all sequence.

In [FFT10a], it was conjectured that this dichotomy should hold in greater generality, namely for balls rather than cylinders and more general systems. As a consequence of Theorem A we will be able to show that the dichotomy indeed holds for balls and more general systems. We remark that from the results in [FP12], one can also derive the dichotomy for conformal repellers and, in [K12], the dichotomy is also obtained for maps with a spectral gap for their Perron-Frobenius operator. In both these papers, the results were obtained by studying the spectral properties of the Perron-Frobenius operator.

3.2.1. *Rychlik maps.*

We will introduce a class of dynamical systems considered by Rychlik in [R83]. This class includes, for example, piecewise C^2 uniformly expanding maps of the unit interval with the relevant physical measures. We first need some definitions.

Definition 3.1. Given a potential $\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ on an interval Y, the *variation* of ψ is defined as

$$\operatorname{Var}(\psi) := \sup\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\psi(x_{i+1}) - \psi(x_i)| \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite ordered sequences $(x_i)_{i=0}^{n} \subset Y$.

We use the norm $\|\psi\|_{BV} = \sup|\psi| + \operatorname{Var}(\psi)$, which makes $BV := \{\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R} : \|\psi\|_{BV} < \infty\}$ into a Banach space. We also define

$$S_n\psi(x) := \psi(x) + \cdots + \psi \circ f^{n-1}(x).$$

Definition 3.2 (Rychlik system)**.** (Y, f, ψ) is a *Rychlik system* if Y is an interval, $\{Y_i\}_i$ is an at most countable collection of open intervals such that $\bigcup_i \overline{Y}_i \supset Y$ (where $\overline{Y}_i$ is the closure of Y_i), $f : \bigcup_i Y_i \to Y$ is a function continuous on each Y_i, which admits a continuous extension to the closure of Y_i that we denote by $f_i : \overline{Y}_i \to Y$ and $\psi : Y \to [-\infty, \infty)$ is a potential such that

1. $f_i : \overline{Y}_i \to f(\overline{Y}_i)$ is a diffeomorphism;
2. $\mathrm{Var}\, \mathrm{e}^{\psi} < +\infty$, $\psi = -\infty$ on $Y \setminus \bigcup_i Y_i$ and $P(\psi) = 0$;
3. there is a ψ-conformal measure m_ψ on Y;
4. (f, ψ) is expanding: $\sup\limits_{x \in Y} \psi(x) < 0$.

Rychlik [R83] proved that these maps have exponential decay of correlations against L^1 observables. To be more precise, if (Y, f, ψ) is a topologically mixing Rychlik system, then there exists an equilibrium state $\mu_\psi = hm_\psi$ where $h \in BV$ is strictly positive and m_ψ and μ_ψ are non-atomic and (Y, f, μ_ψ) has exponential decay of correlations, i.e., there exists $C > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\left| \int \varsigma \circ f^n \cdot \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi - \int \varsigma \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi \int \phi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi \right| \leq C \|\varsigma\|_{L^1(\mu_\psi)} \|\phi\|_{BV} \gamma^n, \tag{3.2}$$

for any $\psi \in L^1(\mu_\psi)$ and $\phi \in BV$. Note that, in the original statement, instead of the $L^1(\mu_\psi)$-norm, it appeared the $L^1(m_\psi)$-norm. However, since h is bounded above and below by positive constants, they are equivalent and we can write (3.2) as it is.

Let $\mathbb{S} = Y \setminus \bigcup_i Y_i$ and define $\Lambda := \{x \in Y : \ f^n(x) \notin \mathbb{S}, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. As a consequence of Theorem A and Lemma 3.1 it follows immediately:

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that (Y, f, ψ) is a topologically mixing Rychlik system, ψ is Hölder continuous on each $\overline{Y}_i$, and μ is the corresponding equilibrium state. For any point $\zeta \in \Lambda$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ is defined as in (2.6), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. Then we have an EVL for M_n and*

1. *if $\zeta \in \Lambda$ is not a periodic point then the EVL is such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$;*
2. *if $\zeta \in \Lambda$ is a (repelling) periodic point of prime period p then the EVL is such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$ where the EI is given by $\vartheta = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta)}$.*

Proof. We start by noting that statement (2) does not need to be proved since it is precisely the content of [FFT10a, Proposition 2].

Regarding statement (1), first note that for Rychlik maps, (3.2) clearly implies that condition (2.20) is satisfied. Besides since U_n must be an interval then $\mathbf{1}_{U_n} \in BV$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{BV} \leq 2$. Moreover, by definition of Λ, we can apply Lemma 3.1 and consequently obtain that $\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n = \infty$. Hence, we are now in condition of applying Theorem A to obtain the result. □

3.2.2. *Piecewise expanding maps in higher dimensions.* As a second example, we will consider multidimensional piecewise uniformly expanding maps for which we follow the definition given by Saussol [S00]. As it is pointed out in [AFL11], these maps generalize Markov maps which also contains one-dimensional piecewise uniformly expanding maps.

We need some notations: $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ being the usual metric in $\mathbb{R}^N$, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we introduce $B_\varepsilon(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathrm{dist}(x,y) < \varepsilon\}$. Moreover, Z being a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, for any $A \subset Z$ and given a real number $c > 0$, we write $B_c(A) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathrm{dist}(x,A) \leq c\}$; Z° stands for the interior of Z, and $\overline{Z}$ is the closure.

Definition 3.3 (Multidimensional piecewise expanding system)**.** (Z, f, μ) is a *multidimensional piecewise expanding system* if Z is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $\overline{Z^\circ} = Z$, $f : Z \to Z$ and $\{Z_i\}$ is a family of at most countably many disjoint open sets such that $\mathrm{Leb}(Z \setminus \bigcup_i Z_i) = 0$ and there exist open sets $\widetilde{Z_i} \supset \overline{Z_i}$ and $C^{1+\alpha}$ maps $f_i : \widetilde{Z_i} \to \mathbb{R}^N$, for some real number $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and some sufficiently small real number $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all i,

(1) $f_i(\widetilde{Z_i}) \supset B_{\varepsilon_1}(f(Z_i))$;

(2) for $x, y \in f(Z_i)$ with $\mathrm{dist}(x,y) \leq \varepsilon_1$,
$$|\det Df_i^{-1}(x) - \det Df_i^{-1}(y)| \leq c|\det Df_i^{-1}(x)|\mathrm{dist}(x,y)^\alpha;$$

(3) there exists $s = s(f) < 1$ such that $\forall x, y \in f(\widetilde{Z_i})$ with $\mathrm{dist}(x,y) \leq \varepsilon_1$, we have
$$\mathrm{dist}(f_i^{-1}x, f_i^{-1}y) \leq s\,\mathrm{dist}(x,y).$$

(4) Let us put $G(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1) := \sup_x G(x, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1)$ where
$$G(x,\varepsilon,\varepsilon_1) := \sum_i \frac{\mathrm{Leb}(f_i^{-1}B_\varepsilon(\partial f Z_i) \cup B_{(1-s)\varepsilon_1}(x))}{\mathrm{Leb}(B_{(1-s)\varepsilon_1}(x))} \tag{3.3}$$
and assume that $\sup\limits_{\delta \leq \varepsilon_1} \left(s^\alpha + 2 \sup\limits_{\varepsilon \leq \delta} \frac{G(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^\alpha}\delta^\alpha\right) < 1$.

Now, let us introduce the space of quasi-Hölder functions in which the spectrum of corresponding Perron-Frobenius operator is investigated. Given a Borel set $\Gamma \subset Z$, we define the oscillation of $\varphi \in L^1(\mathrm{Leb})$ over Γ as
$$\mathrm{osc}(\varphi, \Gamma) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_\Gamma \varphi - \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_\Gamma \varphi.$$

It is easy to verify that $x \mapsto \mathrm{osc}(\varphi, B_\varepsilon(x))$ defines a measurable function (see [S00, Propositin 3.1]). Given real numbers $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, we define α-seminorm of φ as
$$|\varphi|_\alpha = \sup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}} \mathrm{osc}(\varphi, B_\varepsilon(x))\,\mathrm{dLeb}(x).$$
Let us consider the space of functions with bounded α-seminorm
$$V_\alpha = \{\varphi \in L^1(\mathrm{Leb}) : |\varphi|_\alpha < \infty\},$$

and endow V_α with the norm

$$\|\cdot\|_\alpha = \|\cdot\|_{L^1(\mathrm{Leb})} + |\cdot|_\alpha$$

which makes it into a Banach space. We note that V_α is independent of the choice of ε_0. According to [S00, Theorem 5.1], there exists an absolutely continuous invariant probability measure (a.c.i.p.) μ. Also in [S00, Theorem 6.1], it is shown that on the mixing components μ enjoys exponential decay of correlations against L^1 observables on V_α, more precisely, if the map f is as defined above and if μ is the mixing a.c.i.p., then there exist constants $C < \infty$ and $\gamma < 1$ such that

$$\Big|\int_Z \psi\circ f^n\, h\,\mathrm{d}\mu\Big| \le C\|\psi\|_{L^1}\|h\|_\alpha\gamma^n,\ \forall\psi\in L^1,\ \text{where } \int\psi\,\mathrm{d}\mu = 0 \text{ and } \forall h\in V_\alpha. \tag{3.4}$$

We refer the reader to [S00] for the exact values of the above constants.

Let $\mathbb{S} = Z\setminus\bigcup_i Z_i$ and define $\Lambda := \{x\in Z:\ f^n(x)\notin\mathbb{S},\ \text{for all } n\in\mathbb{N}_0\}$. As a consequence of Theorem A and Lemma 3.1 it follows immediately:

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that (Z, f, μ) is a topologically mixing multidimensional piecewise expanding system and μ is its a.c.i.p. For any point $\zeta\in\Lambda$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ is defined as in* (2.6)*, let u_n be such that* (2.12) *holds and assume that U_n, defined in* (2.9)*, is such that* (2.10) *holds. Then we have an EVL for M_n and*

1. *if $\zeta\in\Lambda$ is not a periodic point then the EVL is such that $\bar H(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$;*
2. *if $\zeta\in\Lambda$ is a (repelling) periodic point of prime period p then the EVL is such that $\bar H(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$ where the EI is given by $\vartheta = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta)}$.*

Proof. For proving (1), we can start by remarking that the condition (2.20) is satisfied since we have (3.4). Since U_n corresponds to a ball, by definition of $|\cdot|_\alpha$, it follows easily that $\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\in V_\alpha$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded by above. Now, considering the definition of Λ, we can apply Lemma 3.1 and consequently obtain that $\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n = \infty$. The result then follows by applying Theorem A.

Regarding the proof of the statement (2), as it is pointed out in [FFT10a, Remark 5], one can apply the same argument as in [FFT10a, Proposition 2] and get the result since we have decay of correlations with an L^1-norm estimate. □

3.3. **The Extremal Index at discontinuity points.** Consider a point $\zeta\in Y$. If $\zeta\in\Lambda$ then we say that ζ is a *simple point*. If ζ is a *non-simple point*, which means that $r_{\mathbb{S}}(\zeta)$ is finite, then let $\ell = r_{\mathbb{S}}(\zeta)$ and $z = f^\ell(\zeta)$. Since $z\in\mathbb{S}$ there are $i^+, i^-\in\mathbb{N}$ such that z is the right end point of Y_{i^-} and the left end point of Y_{i^+}. Also, let $z^+\in Y_{i^+}$ and $z^-\in Y_{i^-}$ denote points arbitrarily close to z. Note that, up to some fixed time, we can always choose these points so that their history coincides with that of z and they never hit $\mathbb{S}$. When ζ is a non-simple point we consider that its orbit bifurcates when it hits $\mathbb{S}$ and consider its two possible evolutions. We express this fact by saying that when ζ is non-simple we consider the "orbits" of ζ^+ and ζ^- which are defined in the following way:

- for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ we let $f^j(\zeta^\pm) := f^j(\zeta)$;
- for $j = \ell + 1$, we define $f^j(\zeta^\pm) := f_{i^\pm}(f^{j-1}(\zeta^\pm))$
- for $j > \ell + 1$ we consider two possibilities:
  - if $j-1$ is such that $f^{j-1}(\zeta^\pm) \notin \mathbb{S}$, then we set $f^j(\zeta^\pm) := f(f^{j-1}(\zeta^\pm))$
  - otherwise we set $f^j(\zeta^\pm) := f_i(f^{j-1}(\zeta^\pm))$, where i is such that $f^{j-\ell}(z^\pm) \in Y_i$

Remark 3.3. Note that for the "orbits" of $\zeta^\pm$ just defined above, there is a sequence $(i_j^\pm)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f^n(\zeta^\pm) \in \overline{Y}_{i_n^\pm}$ and $f^n(\zeta^\pm) = f_{i_n^\pm} \circ \dots \circ f_{i_1^\pm}(\zeta)$. Also observe that, in the notation above, $i_\ell^\pm = i^\pm$.

A non-simple point ζ is *aperiodic* if for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f^j(\zeta^+) \neq \zeta \neq f^j(\zeta^-)$.

If there exists $p^\pm$ such that $f^{p^\pm}(\zeta^\pm) = \zeta$ and for $j = 1, \dots, p^\pm - 1$ we have $f^j(\zeta^\pm) \neq \zeta$, but, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f^j(\zeta^\mp) \neq \zeta$, then we say that ζ is *singly returning.* If ζ is singly returning and $f^\pm(\zeta^\pm) = \zeta^\pm$, which means that $f^{p^\pm}(z^\pm) \in Y_{i^\pm}$, then we say that ζ is a *singly periodic* point of period $p^\pm$. If ζ is singly returning and $f^{p^\pm}(\zeta^\pm) = \zeta^\mp$, which means that $f^{p^\pm}(z^\pm) \in Y_{i^\mp}$, then we say that ζ is an *eventually aperiodic* point.

If there exist p^+ and p^- such that $f^{p^+}(\zeta^+) = \zeta = f^{p^-}(\zeta^-)$ and for $j = 1, \dots, p^+ - 1$ and $k = 1, \dots, p^- - 1$ we have $f^j(\zeta^+) \neq \zeta \neq f^k(\zeta^-)$, then we say that ζ is *doubly returning.* In the case, ζ is a doubly returning point and both $f^{p^+}(\zeta^+) = \zeta^+$ and $f^{p^-}(\zeta^-) = \zeta^-$, then we say that ζ is *doubly periodic* with periods p^+ and p^-, respectively. If ζ is doubly returning, $f^{p^\pm}(\zeta^\pm) = \zeta^\pm$ and $f^{p^\mp}(\zeta^\mp) = \zeta^\pm$ then we say that ζ is *doubly returning with a switch.* If ζ is doubly returning, $f^{p^\pm}(\zeta^\pm) = \zeta^\mp$ and $f^{p^\mp}(\zeta^\mp) = \zeta^\pm$ then we say that ζ is *doubly returning with two switches.*

When ζ is a non-simple, repelling doubly returning point and, in the more general case, when $p^- \neq p^+$, the extremal behaviour of the dynamically generated stochastic process $X_0, X_1, \dots$, regarding the occurrence of exceedances of high values, has more than one underlying periodic phenomenon which contrasts with all the cases we have seen so far. Hence, we need to use the machinery developed in [FFT10a, Section 2.3] where some abstract conditions, for general stationary stochastic processes, are given to deal with multiple periodic phenomena. As explained in Remark 3.2, the idea to handle one periodic phenomenon was to replace the role of balls by annuli. In the case of multiple periodic phenomena, this idea is repeated by creating annuli of higher and higher order.

If we assume w.l.o.g. that $p^- < p^+$, when ζ is a non-simple, repelling doubly returning point with no switches, then we would have to use annuli of second order due to the presence of two periodic phenomena of periods: p^- and p^+. However, when ζ is a non-simple, repelling doubly returning point with two switches, we would have to use annuli of fourth order due to the presence of four periodic phenomena with periods: p^-, p^+, $p^+ + p^-$ and $2p^+ + p^-$. This means that, in order to analyse the doubly returning points, using the techniques developed in [FFT10a, Section 2.3], we would have to treat all possible cases separately and in each case check if all the conditions are satisfied which would be very lengthy. Nevertheless, the only main difference here with respect to the case where there is only one periodic phenomenon is that, when we assume w.l.o.g. that $p^- < p^+$, by time p^- we have not yet seen the effect of all periodic behaviour but if we wait until time p^+ then by then all periodicity has been accounted for. This means that we can make some adjustments to the argument in [FFT10a, Theorem 1] dealing with the one periodic phenomenon case and treat the non-simple, repelling doubly returning points at once, regardless of the number of switches. Thus, we will take this last option which also gives some insight on how the proof of [FFT10a, Theorem 1] works.

In what follows consider that

$$U_n^\pm = U_n \cap f^{-\ell}(Y_{i^\pm}).$$

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that (Y, f, ψ) is a topologically mixing Rychlik system, ψ is Hölder continuous on each $\overline{Y}_i$, and μ is the corresponding equilibrium state. Let $\zeta \in Y \setminus \Lambda$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \dots$ is defined as in (2.6), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. We assume that $\mu(U_n^\pm) \sim \alpha^\pm \mu(U_n)$, where $0 < \alpha^-, \alpha^+ < 1$ and $\alpha^- + \alpha^+ = 1$. Then we have an EVL for M_n and*

1. *if ζ is an aperiodic non-simple point then the EVL is such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$;*
2. *if ζ is a non-simple, repelling singly returning point then the EVL is such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$ where the EI is given by $\vartheta = 1 - \alpha^\pm \mathrm{e}^{S_{p^\pm}\psi(\zeta^\pm)}$;*
3. *if ζ is a non-simple, repelling doubly returning point, then the EVL is such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$ where the EI is given by $\vartheta = 1 - \alpha^+ \mathrm{e}^{S_{p^+}\psi(\zeta^+)} - \alpha^- \mathrm{e}^{S_{p^-}\psi(\zeta^-)}$.*

Proof. If ζ is an aperiodic non-simple point then we just have to mimic the argument of Lemma 3.1 and apply it to the two possible evolutions corresponding to the "orbits" of ζ^+ and ζ^-. Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$\epsilon = \min\left\{ \min_{k=1,\dots j} \mathrm{dist}(f^k(\zeta^+), \zeta), \min_{k=1,\dots j} \mathrm{dist}(f^k(\zeta^-), \zeta) \right\}.$$

Now, use the fact that by Remark 3.3, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f^k(\zeta^\pm)$ corresponds to the k-fold composition of continuous functions, in order to choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that U_n is sufficiently small to have that by continuity, for all $k \le j$, both $f_{i_k^+} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_1^+}(U_n^+)$ and $f_{i_k^-} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_1^-}(U_n^-)$ are inside an $\epsilon/2$-ball around $f^k(\zeta^+)$ and $f^k(\zeta^-)$, respectively. This provides that $R_n > j$. As j is arbitrary the statement follows.

Let's consider now statement (2). Assume first that ζ is a singly periodic non-simple point. Without loss of generality, we also assume that there exists p such that $f^p(\zeta^+) = \zeta^+$. In this case we would have to adapt the argument in [FFT10a, Proposition 2] as it follows. Consider that $Q_p(u_n) = \{X_0 > u_n \cap X_p \le u_n\} = U_n^- \cup (U_n^+ \setminus f^{-p}(U_n^+))$. As in [FFT10a, Theorem 5] it is easy to check that condition $SP_{p,\vartheta}(u_n)$ holds with $\vartheta = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mu(Q_p(u_n))}{\mu(U_n)} = 1 - \alpha^+ \mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta^+)}$ since

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(Q_p(u_n)) &= \mu(U_n^-) + \mu(U_n^+ \setminus f^{-p}(U_n^+)) \sim \mu(U_n^-) + (1 - \mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta^+)})\mu(U_n^+) \qquad (3.5)\\ &\sim \alpha^-\mu(U_n) + \alpha^+(1 - \mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta^+)})\mu(U_n).\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(X_0>u_n, X_p>u_n,\ldots,X_{ip}>u_n) &= \mu(U_n^+\cap f^{-p}(U_n^+)\cap\cdots\cap f^{-ip}(U_n^+))\\ &\sim \alpha^+\mathrm{e}^{iS_p\psi(\zeta^+)}\mu(U_n).\end{aligned}$$

Now, we argue as in [FFT10a, Proposition 2] and realise that essentially we need decay of correlations against L^1 observables (which we do have on account of (3.2)) and that $R(Q_p(u_n))\to\infty$, as $n\to\infty$. To check the later just observe that if we start with $x\in U_n^-\cap Q_p(u_n)$ then for any fixed j, as long as n is large enough then we can use the same continuity argument used in statement (1) to prove that $r_{Q_p(u_n)}(x)\geq r_{U_n}(x)>j$. When we start on $x\in U_n^+\cap Q_p(u_n)\subset \overline{Y}_{i_1}$, as in [FFT10a, Proposition 2], we use the structure given by the existence of a repelling periodic orbit at ζ^+, which implies that $\operatorname{dist}(f^p(x),\zeta^+)>\operatorname{dist}(x,\zeta^+)$ and so it will take at least some time, say T, before $f^{Tp}(x)$ exits Y_{i_1}, during which time the orbit x never enters U_n. It is not hard to see that $T>B\log n$ for some constant B independent of n. Hence, $r_{Q_p(u_n)}(x)>B\log n$.

Now, assume that ζ is an eventually aperiodic non-simple point. Without loss of generality, we also assume that there exists p such that $f^p(\zeta^+)=\zeta^-$. As before we set $Q_p(u_n)=\{X_0>u_n\cap X_p\leq u_n\}=U_n^-\cup(U_n^+\setminus f^{-p}(U_n^+))$ and by the same computation as in (3.5) we conclude that $\vartheta=1-\alpha^+\mathrm{e}^{S_p\psi(\zeta^+)}$. However, since, for n sufficiently large, we have that $\mu(\{X_0>u_n,X_p>u_n,\ldots,X_{kp}>u_n\})=0$, for all $k\geq 2$, then condition $SP_{p,\vartheta}(u_n)$ is trivially checked. Finally, the proof that $R(Q_p(u_n))\to\infty$, as $n\to\infty$ follows again from continuity.

Let ζ be a non-simple, repelling doubly returning point and p^-,p^+ be such that $f^{p^-}(\zeta^-)=\zeta$ and $f^{p^+}(\zeta^+)=\zeta$ (with 0,1 or 2 switches). We assume w.l.o.g. that $p^-<p^+$. Let

$$Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)=U_n\cap f^{-p^-}(U_n^c)\cap f^{-p^+}(U_n^c)\quad\text{and}\quad Q^*_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)=U_n\setminus Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n).$$

Now, the annuli $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ will play the role of the original annuli $Q_p(u_n)$. We also define the event

$$\mathscr{Q}_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)=\bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1}f^{-i}((Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))^c)$$

corresponding to no entrances in $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ up to time n. Recall that $\{M_n\leq u_n\}=\bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1}f^{-i}(U_n)$.

One of the main ideas in [FFT10a] was that the probability of never entering the annuli is asymptotically equal to the probability of never entering the balls. To check this observe that

$$\mathscr{Q}_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\setminus\{M_n\leq u_n\}\subset\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\bigcap_{j=i}^{n-1}f^{-j}(Q^*_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))\right)$$

This is because if you enter the ball U_n without hitting $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ then, just before leaving the ball, you have to hit the annulus first. The repelling periodic structure then implies that if you never hit the annulus $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ until time n but meanwhile you hit the ball U_n in the early stages then you must have entered very close to ζ and stay inside of $Q^*_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ until time n. Hence, as in the proof of [FFT10a, Proposition 1], we have the following estimate:

$$\mu\left(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\setminus\{M_n\leq u_n\}\right)\leq\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}2(\vartheta^*)^i\mu(U_n)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0,$$

where $\vartheta^*=\max\{\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^-}(\psi(\zeta^-))},\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^+}(\psi(\zeta^+))}\}$. Consequently, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu(\mathscr{Q}_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))=\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu(M_n\leq u_n).$$

In order to compute $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu(\mathscr{Q}_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))$, we need the following conditions which are basically $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$ where the role of balls is replaced by that of annuli.

Condition $(D^{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))$**.** We say that $D^{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ holds for the sequence $X_0,X_1,\dots$ if for all ℓ,t and n

$$\Big|\mathbb{P}\Big(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\cap\bigcap_{i=t}^{t+\ell-1}f^{-i}((Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))^c)\Big)-\mathbb{P}(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))\mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{i=0}^{\ell-1}f^{-i}((Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))^c)\Big)\Big|\leq\gamma(n,t),$$

where $\gamma(n,t)$ is decreasing in t for each n and $n\gamma(n,t_n)\to0$ when $n\to\infty$ for some sequence $t_n=o(n)$.

Now, let $(k_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of integers as in (2.14).

Condition $(D'_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))$**.** We say that $D'_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ holds for the sequence $X_0,X_1,\dots$ if there exists a sequence $\{k_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (2.14) and such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\cap f^{-j}(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)))=0.$$

Following step by step the proof of Theorem 1 in [FFT10a], with $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ in the place of the original $Q_p(u_n)$, we are immediately led to

$$\left|\mu(\mathscr{Q}_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))-\left(1-\frac{n}{k_n}\mu(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))\right)^{k_n}\right|\leq\mathrm{Error}(n),$$

where

$$\mathrm{Error(n)}\leq n\gamma(n,t_n)+2n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\cap f^{-j}(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)))+k_nt_n\mu(U_n),$$

which goes to 0, as $n\to\infty$, by $D^{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$, $D'_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ and (2.12). Since by definition of $Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ we have

$$n\mu(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))\sim n\mu(U_n)[\alpha^-(1-\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^-}(\psi(\zeta^-))})+\alpha^+(1-\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^+}(\psi(\zeta^+))})].$$

It follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(1-\frac{n}{k_n}\mu(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)\right)^{k_n}=\mathrm{e}^{-\vartheta\tau}$, where

$$\vartheta=1-\alpha^-\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^-}(\psi(\zeta^-))}-\alpha^+\mathrm{e}^{-S_{p^+}(\psi(\zeta^+))}.$$

Hence, the result follows if conditions $D^{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ and $D'_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ are verifyed.

Condition $D^{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$ follows trivially from (3.2), by taking $\phi=\mathbf{1}_{Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)}$ and $\psi=\mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{i=0}^{\ell-1}f^{-i}((Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))^c)}$ and observing that $\|\phi\|_{BV}\leq 4$.

Regarding condition $D'_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$, we argue again as in [FFT10a, Proposition 2] and realise that essentially we need decay of correlations against L^1 observables (which we do have on account of (3.2)) and that $R(Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n))\to\infty$, as $n\to\infty$. Starting with $x\in U_n^\pm\cap Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)$, as in [FFT10a, Proposition 2], we use the structure given by the existence of repelling periodic orbits at $\zeta^\pm$, which implies that $\mathrm{dist}(f^{p^\pm}(x),\zeta)>\mathrm{dist}(x,\zeta)$ and so it will take at least some time, say T, before the orbit x enters U_n again. It is not hard to see that $T>B\log n$ for some constant B independent of n. Hence, $r_{Q_{(p^-,p^+)}(u_n)}(x)>B\log n$. □

4. Extremes for random dynamics

In this section we will start with the proof of Theorem C which states that the dichotomy observed in Section 3 vanishes when we add absolutely continuous noise (w.r.t. Lebesgue) and for every chosen point in the phase space we have a standard exponential distribution for the EVL and HTS/RTS weak limits. Next, we will give some examples of random dynamical systems for which we can prove the existence of EVLs and HTS/RTS.

In what follows, we denote the diameter of set $A\subset\mathcal{M}$ by $|A|:=\sup\{\mathrm{dist}(x,y):\ x,y\in A\}$ and for any $x\in\mathcal{M}$ we define the translation of A by x as the set: $A+x:=\{a+x:\ a\in A\}$.

4.1. **Laws of rare events for random dynamics.**

Proof of Theorem C. Firstly, we want to show that, as in the deterministic case, the condition $D_2(u_n)$ can be deduced from the decay of correlations.

From our assumption the random dynamical system has (annealed) decay of correlations, *i.e.*, there exists a Banach space $\mathcal{C}$ of real valued functions such that for all $\phi\in\mathcal{C}$ and $\psi\in L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)$,

$$\Big|\int\phi(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^t\psi)(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon-\int\phi\,\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon\int\psi\,\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon\Big|\leq C\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{C}}\|\psi\|_{L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)}t^{-2} \tag{4.1}$$

where $C>0$ is a constant independent of both φ and ψ.

In proving $D_2(U_n)$, the main point is to choose the right observable. Let us take

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x) &= \mathbf{1}_{\{X_0>u_n\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(x)>u_n\}},\\ \psi(x) &= \int \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(x),\,\varphi\circ f_{\tilde\omega_1}(x),\,\dots\,,\,\varphi\circ f^{\ell-1}_{\underline{\tilde\omega}}(x)\le u_n\}}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\ell-1}(\underline{\tilde\omega}).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting ψ in the random evolution operator, we get

$$(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^t\psi)(x) = \int \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi\circ f^t_{\underline{\omega}}(x),\,\dots\,,\,\varphi\circ f^{\ell-1}_{\underline{\tilde\omega}}\circ f^t_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\}}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\ell-1}(\underline{\tilde\omega})\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^t(\underline{\omega}).$$

Since all ω_i's and $\tilde\omega_j$'s are chosen in an i.i.d. structure, we can rename the random iterates, *i.e.*, we lose no information in writing

$$(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^t\psi)(x) = \int \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi\circ f^t_{\underline{\omega}}(x),\,\dots\,,\,\varphi\circ f^{t+\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\}}\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega}).$$

Therefore, we get

$$\int \phi(x)\,(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon^t\psi)(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon = \int \mu_\varepsilon\Big(\varphi(x)>u_n, \varphi\circ f^t_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n,\,\dots,\varphi\circ f^{t+\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\Big)\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\int \phi(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon &= \mu_\varepsilon(X_0(x)>u_n) = \int \mu_\varepsilon(X_0(x)>u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega})\\ \int \psi(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon &= \int\Big(\int \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(x),\varphi\circ f_{\omega_1}(x),\,\dots\,,\varphi\circ f^{\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\}}\mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon\Big)\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega})\\ &= \int \mu_\varepsilon\Big(\varphi(x)\le u_n, \varphi\circ f_{\omega_1}(x)\le u_n,\,\dots\,,\varphi\circ f^{\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\Big)\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega}).\end{aligned}$$

Now, the decay of correlations can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int \mu_\varepsilon\big(X_0(x)>u_n, \varphi\circ f^t_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n,\,\dots\,,\varphi\circ f^{t+\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\big)\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega})-\\ &\int \mu_\varepsilon(\varphi(x)>u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega})\int \mu_\varepsilon\big(\varphi(x)\le u_n, \varphi\circ f_{\omega_1}(x)\le u_n,\,\dots\,,\varphi\circ f^{\ell-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(x)\le u_n\big)\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\underline{\omega})\Big|\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\le C\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{C}}\|\psi\|_{L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)}t^{-2}\end{aligned}$$

which leads us to the conclusion that the condition $D_2(u_n)$ holds with

$$\gamma(n,t)=\gamma(t)=C^*t^{-2} \tag{4.2}$$

for some $C^*>0$ and $t_n=n^\beta$, with $1/2<\beta<1$.

For proving $D'(u_n)$, the basic idea is to use the fact that we have decay of correlations against L^1 as in Theorem A and then show that except for a small set of $\underline{\omega}$'s, $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)$

grows at a sufficiently fast rate. Hence, we split Ω into two parts: the $\underline{\omega}$'s for which $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) > \alpha_n$, where $(\alpha_n)_n$ is some sequence such that

$$\alpha_n \to \infty \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_n = o(\log k_n), \tag{4.3}$$

which is designed, on one hand, to guarantee that for the $\underline{\omega}$'s for which $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) > \alpha_n$, the argument using decay of correlations against L^1 is still applicable and, on the other hand, the set of the $\underline{\omega}$'s for which $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \leq \alpha_n$ has $\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ small measure. To show the latter we make an estimate on the $\underline{\omega}$'s that take the orbit of ζ too close to itself.

First, note that since f is continuous (which implies that $f_{\underline{\omega}}^j$ is also continuous for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$) and η is the highest rate at which points can separate, the diameter of $f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(U_n)$ grows at most at a rate given by η^j, so, for any $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$ we have $|f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(U_n)| \leq \eta^j |U_n|$. This implies that

$$\text{if } \operatorname{dist}(f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(\zeta), \zeta) > 2\eta^j |U_n| > |U_n| + \eta^j |U_n| \text{ then } f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(U_n) \cap U_n = \emptyset. \tag{4.4}$$

Note that, by equation (4.4), if for all $j = 1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ we have $\operatorname{dist}(f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(\zeta), \zeta) > 2\eta^j |U_n|$ then clearly $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) > \alpha_n$. Hence, we may write that

$$\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \leq \alpha_n\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \{\underline{\omega}:\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(\zeta) \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\}.$$

It follows that, there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \leq \alpha_n\}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right) + \omega_j \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : \omega_j \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta) - f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right)\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \int_{B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta) - f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right)} g_\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{dLeb} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \overline{g_\varepsilon} \mathrm{Leb}\left(B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \overline{g_\varepsilon} C \eta^j \mathrm{Leb}(U_n) \\
&\leq C \overline{g_\varepsilon} \mathrm{Leb}(U_n) \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1} \eta^{\alpha_n}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(U_n\cap f_{\underline{\omega}}^{-j}(U_n)) &= n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in U_n\})\\
&= n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)>\alpha_n\})\\
&\quad + n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)\le\alpha_n\})\\
&\le n\sum_{\alpha_n}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)>\alpha_n\})\\
&\quad + n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)\le\alpha_n\})
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us start with estimating the first term, which will be dealt as in Section 3. Taking $\psi=\phi=\mathbf{1}_{U_n}$ in (4.1) and since $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\le C'$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in\ U_n\}) &\le (\mu_\varepsilon(U_n))^2 + C\,\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\,\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_{L^1(\mu_\varepsilon)}\,j^{-2}\\
&\le (\mu_\varepsilon(U_n))^2 + C^*\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)j^{-2}, \qquad (4.5)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C^*=CC'>0$. Now observe that by definition of U_n and (2.12), we have that $\mu_\epsilon(U_n)\sim\tau/n$. Using this observation together with the definition of $R_n^{\underline{\omega}}$ and the estimate (4.5), it follows that there exists some constant $D>0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& n\sum_{j=\alpha_n}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n,\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j}(x)\in\ U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)>\alpha_n\})\\
&\qquad \le n\lfloor\tfrac{n}{k_n}\rfloor\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)^2 + n\,C^*\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)\sum_{j=\alpha_n}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}j^{-2} \le \frac{(n\mu_\varepsilon(U_n))^2}{k_n} + n\,C^*\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)\sum_{j=\alpha_n}^{\infty}j^{-2}\\
&\qquad \le D\left(\frac{\tau^2}{k_n}+\tau\sum_{j=\alpha_n}^{\infty}j^{-2}\right)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the second term, as $\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)\sim\tau/n$ and since $d\mu_\varepsilon/d\mathrm{Leb}$ is bounded below and above by positive constants, there exists some positive constant $C^*>0$ so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
n\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/k_n\rfloor}\mathbb{P}(\{(x,\underline{\omega}): x\in U_n, R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)\le\alpha_n\}) &\le \frac{n^2}{k_n}\mu_\varepsilon(U_n)C\overline{g_\varepsilon}\mathrm{Leb}(U_n)\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}\eta^{\alpha_n}\\
&\le C^*\frac{\eta^{\alpha_n}}{k_n}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0 \quad \text{by (4.3)}. \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

□

4.2. **Laws of rare events for specific randomly perturbed systems.**

4.2.1. *Expanding and piecewise expanding maps on the circle with a finite number of discontinuities.* We give a general definition which we borrow from [V97] of piecewise expanding maps on the circle which also includes the particular case of the continuous expanding maps:

(1) there exist $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_\ell = 1 = 0 = a_0$ for which the restriction of f to each $\Xi_i = (a_{i-1}, a_i)$ is of class C^1, with $|Df(x)| > 0$ for all $x \in \Xi_i$ and $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$. In addition, for all $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, $g_{\Xi_i} = 1/|Df|_{\Xi_i}|$ has bounded variation for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$.

We assume that $(f|_{\Xi_i})$ and g_{Ξ_i} admit continuous extensions to $\Xi_i = [a_{i-1}, a_i]$, for each $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$. Since modifying the values of a map over a finite set of points does not change its statistical properties, we may assume that f is either left-continuous or right-continuous (or both) at a_i, for each $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ (possibly for all i's at the same time). Then let $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}$ be some partition of $\mathcal{S}^1$ into intervals Ξ such that $\Xi \subset \Xi_i$ for some i and $(f|\Xi)$ is continuous. Furthermore, for $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ be the partition of $\mathcal{S}^1$ such that $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(x) = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(y)$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(f^j(x)) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(f^j(y))$ for all $0 \leq j < n$. Given $\Xi \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$, denote $g_\Xi^{(n)} = 1/|Df^n|_\Xi|$;

(2) there exist constants $C_1 > 0, \lambda_1 < 1$ such that $\sup g_\Xi^{(n)} \leq C_1 \lambda_1^n$ for all $\Xi \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ and all $n \geq 1$;
(3) for every subinterval J of $\mathcal{S}^1$, there exists some $n \geq 1$ such that $f^n(J) = \mathcal{S}^1$.

According to [V97, Proposition 3.15], one has exponential decay of correlations for randomly perturbed systems derived from maps satisfying conditions $(1)-(3)$ above, taking $\mathcal{C}$ as the space of functions with bounded variation (BV), *i.e.*, given φ in BV and $\psi \in L^1(\text{Leb})$,

$$\left| \int (\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \psi) \varphi \, \mathrm{dLeb} - \int \psi \, \mathrm{d}\mu_\varepsilon \int \varphi \, \mathrm{dLeb} \right| \leq C \lambda^n \|\varphi\|_{BV} \|\psi\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}, \tag{4.7}$$

where $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $C > 0$ is a constant independent of both φ, ψ.

Hence, in the particular case f is a continuous expanding map of the circle, then (4.7), Theorem C and Corollary D allow us to obtain

Corollary 4.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{S}^1 \to \mathcal{S}^1$ be a continuous expanding map satisfying $(1)-(3)$ above, which is randomly perturbed as in (2.2) with noise distribution given by (2.1). For any point $\zeta \in \mathcal{S}^1$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ is defined as in (2.7), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. Then the stochastic process $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ satisfies $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$, which implies that we have an EVL for M_n such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$ and we have exponential HTS/RTS for balls around ζ.*

In the proof of Theorem C, we used the continuity of the map, in particular, in (4.4). However, we can adapt the argument in order to allow a finite number of discontinuities for expanding maps of the circle.

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $f:\mathcal{S}^1\to\mathcal{S}^1$ *be a map satisfying conditions* (1) – (3) *above, which is randomly perturbed as in* (2.2) *with noise distribution given by* (2.1)*. For any point* $\zeta\in\mathcal{S}^1$*, consider that* $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ *is defined as in* (2.7)*, let* u_n *be such that* (2.12) *holds and assume that* U_n*, defined in* (2.9)*, is such that* (2.10) *holds. Then the stochastic process* $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ *satisfies* $D_2(u_n)$ *and* $D'(u_n)$*, which implies that we have an EVL for* M_n *such that* $\bar{H}(\tau)=\mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$ *and we have exponential HTS/RTS for balls around* ζ*.*

Proof. The proof of $D_2(u_n)$ follows from (4.7) as in the continuous case. Regarding the proof of $D'(u_n)$, in order to use the same arguments as in the continuous case, we want to avoid coming close to the discontinuity points along the random orbit of ζ (up to time α_n). Since there are finitely many discontinuity points, say ξ_i's for $i=1,\ldots,\ell$, we can control this by putting safety boxes around each of them. By doing so, we ensure that the random orbit of ζ is sufficiently far away from ξ_i's so that the iterates of U_n consist of only one connected component. We can formulate these safety regions as

$$\operatorname{dist}(f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta),\xi_i)>2\eta^j|U_n| \text{ for all } i=1,\ldots,\ell. \tag{4.8}$$

Now, we make an estimate on the $\underline{\omega}$'s that take the orbit of ζ too close to the discontinuity points as well as close to ζ itself and our aim is to show that the $\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ measure of this set is small. Let us set $\xi_0=\zeta$ to simplify the notation. Then,

$$\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)\le\alpha_n\}\subset\bigcup_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell}\{\underline{\omega}:\ f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\xi_i)\}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)\le\alpha_n\})&\le\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j: f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right)+\omega_j\in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\xi_i)\})\\&\le\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j:\omega_j\in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\xi_i)-f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right)\})\\&\le\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\int_{B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\xi_i)-f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right)}g_\varepsilon(x)dx\\&\le\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\overline{g_\varepsilon}\left|B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\xi_i)\right|=\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n}\overline{g_\varepsilon}4\eta^j|U_n|\\&\le4(\ell+1)\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_n|\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}\eta^{\alpha_n}.\end{aligned}$$

The proof now follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem C. □

4.2.2. *Expanding and piecewise expanding maps in higher dimensions.* Let us now consider the multidimensional piecewise expanding systems defined in Section 3.2.2 but only with a finite number, K, of domains of local injectivity; moreover let us restrict ourselves to a mixing component which, for simplicity, we will take as the whole space Z; we will put μ as the unique absolutely continuous invariant measure with density h. In addition, we ask each ∂Z_i to be included in piecewise C^1 codimension-1 embedded compact submanifolds and for $Z(f) = \sup\limits_x \sum_{i=1}^K \#\{$ smooth pieces intersecting ∂Z_i containing $x\}$

$$s^\alpha + \frac{4s}{1-s} Z(f) \frac{\gamma_{N-1}}{\gamma_N} < 1, \tag{4.9}$$

where γ_N is the N-volume of the N-dimensional unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then, we know that by Lemma 2.1. in [S00], item (4) in Definition 3.3 is satisfied. Notice that formula (4.9) gives exponential decay of correlations for the adapted pair: L^1 functions against functions in the quasi-Hölder space V_α.

We perturb again this kind of maps with additive noise by asking that the image of Z is strictly included in Z. We will also require that the density h is bounded from below by the positive constant h_m. We will now prove the exponential decay of correlations for the random evolution operator $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$, by using the perturbation theory in [KL09], which we will also quote and use later on in Section 5.2. This theory ensures us that the perturbed Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ is mixing on the adapted pair (L^1, V_α) whenever we have:

(i) a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for $\mathcal{P}_\epsilon$, *i.e.*, all the constants in that inequality are independent of the noise ε,

(ii) the closeness property (see also hypothesis **H4** in Sect. 5.2 below): there exists a monotone upper semi-continuous function $p : \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} p_\varepsilon = 0$ and $\forall \varphi \in V_\alpha$, $\forall \varepsilon \in \Omega : ||\mathcal{P}\varphi - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \varphi||_1 \leq p_\varepsilon ||\varphi||_\alpha$.

Condition (i) follows easily by observing that the quantity (4.9) will not change when we perturb the map: the derivative of the original and of the perturbed maps are the same, and this does not change the contraction factor s, and the multiplicity of the boundaries intersection, $Z(f)$, is invariant too. Therefore the Perron-Frobenius operators $\mathcal{P}_\omega$ associated to the perturbed maps f_ω verify the same Lasota-Yorke inequality and therefore the same is true for $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$.

Our next step is to prove condition (ii), in particular we have

Proposition 4.3. *There exists a constant C such that for any $\varphi \in V_\alpha$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{P}\varphi - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \varphi\|_1 \leq C\varepsilon^\alpha ||\varphi||_\alpha.$$

Proof. We have:

$$\|\mathcal{P}\varphi - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \varphi\|_1 \leq \int_Z \int_\Omega |\mathcal{P}_\omega \varphi(x) - \mathcal{P}\varphi(x)| \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega) \mathrm{d}x$$

We put $G(x) = \frac{1}{|\det Df(x)|}$. Then

$$|\mathcal{P}_\omega\varphi(x) - \mathcal{P}\varphi(x)| \le \sum_{Z_i, i=1,\dots,K} |\varphi(f_i^{-1}x)G(f_i^{-1}x)\mathbf{1}_{fZ_i}(x) - \varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)G(f_i^{-1}x)\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x)| + \sum_{Z_i, i=1,\dots,K} |\varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)||G(f_i^{-1}x) - G(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)|\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x) \tag{4.10}$$

where $f_\omega(x) = f(x) + \omega$ and ω is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with each component in modulus less than ε. Moreover $f_{\omega,i}^{-1}$ denotes the inverse of the restriction of f_ω to Z_i, also denoted with $f_{\omega,i}$. We now bound the first sum in (4.10) by considering two cases:
(i) Let us suppose first that $x \in fZ_i \cap f_{\omega,i}Z_i$. Then since both f and $f_{\omega,i}$ are injective, there will be two points, y_i and $y_{\omega,i}$ in Z_i such that $x = f(y_i) = f_{\omega,i}(y_{\omega,i}) = f(y_{\omega,i}) + \omega$. This immediately implies that $\text{dist}(y_i, y_{\omega,i}) \le s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon$, if dist is the Euclidean distance. For such an x we continue to bound the first sum in (4.10) as:

$$(4.10) \le \sum_{Z_i, i=1,\dots,K} G(f_i^{-1}x)\text{osc}(\varphi, B_{s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon}(f_i^{-1}(x)))\mathbf{1}_{fZ_i}(x)$$

By integrating over Z we get

$$\int_Z \Big(\sum_{Z_i, i=1,\dots,K} G(f_i^{-1}x)\text{osc}(\varphi, B_{s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon}(f_i^{-1}(x)))\mathbf{1}_{fZ_i}(x)\Big)\mathrm{d}x = \int_Z \mathcal{P}(\text{osc}(\varphi, B_{s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon}(x)))\mathrm{d}x$$

$$= \int_Z \text{osc}(\varphi, B_{s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon}(x))\mathrm{d}x \le (s\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha |\varphi|_\alpha.$$

(ii) We now consider the case when $x \notin fZ_i \cap f_{\omega,i}Z_i$; in this case x will be in one or in the other of these two sets and the measure of the points x having this property will be bounded by twice the volume of a sphere with radius ε in $\mathbb{R}^N$: $\gamma'_N\varepsilon^N$. In this situation we get

$$\int_Z |\mathcal{P}_\omega\varphi(x) - \mathcal{P}\varphi(x)|\mathrm{d}x \le 2\gamma'_N\varepsilon^N\|\varphi\|_\infty\|\mathcal{P}1\|_\infty \tag{4.11}$$

We notice that the inclusion $V_\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\infty_m$ is bounded, namely there exists c_v such that $\|\varphi\|_\infty \le c_v\|\varphi\|_\alpha$. We therefore continue (4.11) as

$$(4.11) \le 2\gamma'_N\varepsilon^N c_v\|\varphi\|_\alpha\|\mathcal{P}\frac{h}{h}\|_\infty \le 2\gamma'_N\varepsilon^N c_v\|\varphi\|_\alpha\frac{\|h\|_\infty}{h_m}$$

We now come to the second sum in (4.10); we begin to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}|G(f_i^{-1}x)-G(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)| &= \left|\frac{1}{|\det Df(f_i^{-1}x)|}-\frac{1}{|\det Df(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)|}\right| \\ &= \left|\frac{1}{|\det Df(y_i)|}-\frac{1}{|\det Df(y_{\omega,i})|}\right| \\ &= \Big||\det Df_i^{-1}(x)|-|\det Df_i^{-1}(z)|\Big| \\ &\leq |\det Df_i^{-1}(x)-\det Df_i^{-1}(z)|\end{aligned}$$

where $z=f(y_{\omega,i})$ and $\mathrm{dist}(x,z)\leq\sqrt{N}\varepsilon$. By using the Hölder assumption (2) in Definition 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{Z_i,i=1,\dots,K}|\varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)||G(f_i^{-1}x)-G(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)|\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x) \\ &\qquad\leq c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha\sum_{Z_i,i=1,\dots,K}|\varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)||\det Df_i^{-1}(z)|\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x) \\ &\qquad\leq c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha\sum_{Z_i,i=1,\dots,K}|\varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)|\frac{1}{|\det Df(f_i^{-1}(z))|}\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x) \\ &\qquad\leq c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha\sum_{Z_i,i=1,\dots,K}|\varphi(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}x)|\frac{1}{|\det Df(f_{\omega,i}^{-1}(x))|}\mathbf{1}_{f_\omega Z_i}(x).\end{aligned}$$

By integrating over Z we get the contribution

$$c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha\int_Z\mathcal{P}_\omega(|\varphi|)\mathrm{d}x\leq c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha\int_Z|\varphi|\mathrm{d}x\leq c(\sqrt{N}\varepsilon)^\alpha||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathrm{Leb})}.$$

In conclusion we get $\|\mathcal{P}\varphi-\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon\varphi\|_1\leq C\varepsilon^\alpha\|\varphi\|_\alpha$, where the constant C collects the various constants introduced above. □

As a consequence of Proposition 4.3 we obtain exponential decay of correlations of quasi-Hölder functions (in V_α), against L^1 functions, in particular, for uniformly expanding maps on the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$. Since, $\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\in V_\alpha$, $\|\mathbf{1}_{U_n}\|_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded by above it then follows by Theorem C and Corollary D that

Corollary 4.4. *Let $f:\mathbb{T}^d\to\mathbb{T}^d$ be a C^2 uniformly expanding map on $\mathbb{T}^d$, which is randomly perturbed as in* (2.2) *with noise distribution given by* (2.1). *For any point $\zeta\in\mathbb{T}^d$, consider that $X_0,X_1,\dots$ is defined as in* (2.7), *let u_n be such that* (2.12) *holds and assume that U_n, defined in* (2.9), *is such that* (2.10) *holds. Then the stochastic process $X_0,X_1,\dots$ satisfies $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$, which implies that we have an EVL for M_n such that $\bar{H}(\tau)=\mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$ and we have exponential HTS/RTS for balls around ζ.*

As in the previous case of maps on the circle, we may adapt the argument used in the continuous case to consider the more general piecewise expanding maps of definition 3.3, as long as, there are only a finite number of domains of local injectivity.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that (Z, f, μ) is a topologically mixing multidimensional piecewise expanding system as in definition 3.3, μ is the a.c.i.p. with a Radon-Nikodym density bounded away from 0. We assume that there are $K \in \mathbb{N}$ domains of injectivity of the map and there exists $\eta > 1$ such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, K$ and all $x, y \in Z_i$ we have $dist(f(x), f(y)) \leq \eta\, dist(x, y)$. Consider that such a map is randomly perturbed with additive noise as in (2.2) with noise distribution given by (2.1) and such that the image of Z is strictly included in Z. For any point $\zeta \in Z$, consider that $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ is defined as in (2.7), let u_n be such that (2.12) holds and assume that U_n, defined in (2.9), is such that (2.10) holds. Then the stochastic process $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ satisfies $D_2(u_n)$ and $D'(u_n)$, which implies that we have an EVL for M_n such that $\bar{H}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tau}$ and we have exponential HTS/RTS for balls around ζ.*

Proof. Before, for maps on the circle, by putting some safety boxes around the discontinuity points we guaranteed that the iterates of $f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ had one connected component. Since in this case the border of the domains of injectivity are codimension-1 submanifolds instead of single points (as in the 1-dimensional case), we must proceed to a more thorough analysis. To that end, for each $\underline{\omega}$, for $j = 1$ let $1 \leq l_1 \leq K$ be the number of intersections with non-empty interior between $f_{\underline{\omega}}(U_n)$ and Z_i, with $i = 1, \ldots, K$. For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, l_1$, let i_ℓ denote the index of the partition element Z_{i_ℓ} for which such intersection has non-empty interior, define $U_n^{(1,\ell)} := f_{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \cap Z_{i_\ell}$ and let $\zeta_{1,\ell}$ be a point in the interior of $U_n^{(1,\ell)}$. For any $j = 2, \ldots, \alpha_n$, given the sets $U_n^{(j-1,k)}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, l_{j-1}$, let l_j be the total number of intersections of non-empty interior between $f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}\left(U_n^{(j-1,k)}\right)$ and Z_i, with $i = 1, \ldots, K$. For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, l_j$, let i_ℓ denote the index of the partition element Z_{i_ℓ} and k_ℓ the super index of the sets $U_n^{(j-1,k)}$ for which the intersection between $f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}\left(U_n^{(j-1,k_\ell)}\right)$ and Z_{i_ℓ} has non-empty interior, define $U_n^{(j,\ell)} = f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}\left(U_n^{(j-1,k_\ell)}\right) \cap Z_{i_\ell}$ and let $\zeta_{j,\ell}$ be a point in the interior of $U_n^{(j,\ell)}$.

In order to avoid the first return time to U_n to occur before α_n, in a resemblant way to the previous proofs, we require that:

$$\mathrm{dist}(f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}(\zeta_{j-1,\ell}), \zeta) > 2\eta^j |U_n| \text{ for all } j = 2, \ldots, \alpha_n,\ \ell = 1, \ldots, l_{j-1}. \tag{4.12}$$

Note that, as in the proof of Theorem C, for any $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$, we have $|U_n^{(j,\ell)}| \leq \eta^j |U_n|$. This implies that

$$\text{if } \mathrm{dist}(f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}(\zeta_{j-1,\ell}), \zeta) > 2\eta^j |U_n| > |U_n| + \eta^j |U_n| \text{ then } U_n^{(j,\ell)} \cap U_n = \emptyset. \tag{4.13}$$

Note that, by equation (4.13), if (4.12) holds then clearly $R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) > \alpha_n$. Hence, letting $l_0 = 1$ and $\zeta_{0,1} = \zeta$, we may write that

$$\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \leq \alpha_n\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{l_{j-1}} \{\underline{\omega}:\ f_{\sigma^{j-1}(\underline{\omega})}(\zeta_{j-1,\ell}) \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\}.$$

Recalling that $l_j \leq K^j$, for all $j = 1, \ldots, \alpha_n$, it follows that, there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(\{\underline{\omega}:\ R^{\underline{\omega}}(U_n) \leq \alpha_n\}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{l_{j-1}} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : f\left(\zeta_{j-1,\ell}\right) + \omega_j \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{l_{j-1}} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : \omega_j \in B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta) - f\left(\zeta_{j-1,\ell}\right)\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{l_{j-1}} \overline{g_\varepsilon} \mathrm{Leb}\left(B_{2\eta^j|U_n|}(\zeta)\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_n} K^j \overline{g_\varepsilon} C \eta^j \mathrm{Leb}(U_n) \\
&\leq C \overline{g_\varepsilon} \mathrm{Leb}(U_n) \frac{\eta K}{\eta K - 1} (\eta K)^{\alpha_n}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the proof follows exactly in the same way as the proof of Theorem C, except that in the final estimate (4.6), η should be replaced by ηK, which will not make any difference by the choice of α_n carried out in (4.3). □

5. EXTREMES FOR RANDOM DYNAMICS FROM A SPECTRAL APPROACH

In this section, we want to prove our results for the random setting using another approach introduced by Keller in [K12]. His technique is based on an eigenvalue perturbation formula which was given in [KL09] under a certain number of assumptions which we are going to remind in the first subsection and adapt to our situation.

5.1. **The setting.** Given a Banach space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$, and a set of parameters E which is equipped with some topology, let us suppose there are $\lambda_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$, $\varphi_\varepsilon \in V$, $\nu_\varepsilon \in V'$ (V' denotes the dual of V) and linear operators $P_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon : V \to V$ such that

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} P_\varepsilon = \varphi_\varepsilon \otimes \nu_\varepsilon + Q_\varepsilon \text{ (assume } \lambda_0 = 1) \ , \tag{5.1}$$

$$P_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \lambda_\varepsilon \varphi_\varepsilon, \nu_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon \nu_\varepsilon, \ Q_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 0, \ \nu_\varepsilon Q_\varepsilon = 0, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{\varepsilon \in E} \|Q_\varepsilon^n\| =: C_1 < \infty, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\exists C_2 > 0, \forall \varepsilon \in E : \nu_0(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 1 \text{ and } \|\varphi_\varepsilon\| \le C_2 < \infty, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \|\nu_0(P_0 - P_\varepsilon)\| = 0, \tag{5.5}$$

$$\|\nu_0(P_0 - P_\varepsilon)\| \cdot \|(P_0 - P_\varepsilon)\varphi_0\| \le \text{const} \cdot |\Delta_\varepsilon| \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$\Delta_\varepsilon := \nu_0((P_0 - P_\varepsilon)(\varphi_0)).$$

Under these assumptions, Keller and Liverani got the following formula as the main result in [KL09]:

$$1 - \lambda_\varepsilon = \Delta_\varepsilon \vartheta (1 + o(1)) \text{ in the limit as } \varepsilon \to 0 \tag{5.7}$$

where ϑ is said to be a constant to take care of short time correlations, which is later to be identified with the extremal index in extreme value theory context as it is mentioned in [K12, Section 1.2]. Actually ϑ is given by an explicit and, in some cases, computable formula, and, in fact, we will be able to compute it for our random systems. This formula is the content of Theorem 2.1 in [KL09] and states that under the above assumptions, in particular when $\Delta_\varepsilon \neq 0$, for ε small enough, and whenever the following limit exists

$$q_k := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} q_{k,\varepsilon} := \lim_{\varepsilon \to \infty} \frac{\nu_0((P_0 - P_\varepsilon) P_\varepsilon^k (P_0 - P_\varepsilon)(\varphi_0))}{\Delta_\varepsilon} \tag{5.8}$$

we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1 - \lambda_\varepsilon}{\Delta_\varepsilon} = \vartheta := 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_k. \tag{5.9}$$

We now state equivalent ways to verify assumptions (5.1)-(5.6), we refer to [K12] for the details.

(A1) There are constants $A > 0, B > 0, D > 0$ and a second norm $|\cdot|_\omega \le \|\cdot\|$ on V (it is enough to be a seminorm) such that:

$$\forall \varepsilon \in E, \forall \psi \in V, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} : |P_\varepsilon^n \psi|_\omega \le D|\psi|_\omega \tag{5.10}$$

$$\exists \alpha \in (0,1), \forall \varepsilon \in E, \forall \psi \in V, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \|P_\varepsilon^n \psi\| \le A\alpha^n \|\psi\| + B|\psi|_\omega \tag{5.11}$$

Moreover the closed unit ball of $(V, \|\cdot\|)$, is $|\cdot|_\omega$-compact.

(A2) The unperturbed operator verifies the mixing condition

$$P = \varphi \otimes \nu + Q_0 \text{ (assume } \lambda_0 = 1)$$

(A3) $\exists C > 0$ such that

$$\eta_\varepsilon := \sup_{\|\psi\|\le 1} \left| \int (P_0 - P_\varepsilon)\psi \, \mathrm{d}\nu_0 \right| \to 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0 \tag{5.12}$$

(A4) and

$$\eta_\varepsilon \ \|(P_0 - P_\varepsilon)\varphi_0\| \le C \ \Delta_\varepsilon \tag{5.13}$$

Keller called this framework *Rare events Perron-Frobenius operators*, REPFO, [K12], and we are going to construct a *perturbed* Perron-Frobenius operator which satisfies the previous assumptions and which will give us information on extreme value distributions and statistics of first returns to small sets.

Before continuing, we should come back to our extreme distributions, namely to the quantity $\{M_m \le u_m\} = \{r_{\{\phi > u_m\}} > m\}$ where $U_m := \{\phi > u_m\}$ is a topological ball shrinking to the point ζ (see (2.9) and (2.10): we changed U_n into U_m here). Now we consider the first time the point x enters U_m under the realization $\underline{\omega}$, namely under the composition $\cdots \circ f_{\omega_k} \circ f_{\omega_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1}(x)$, $r^{\underline{\omega}}_{U_m}(x)$. For simplicity we indicate it by $r^{\underline{\omega}}_m(x)$ and consider its annealed distribution:

$$(\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})((x, \underline{\omega}) : r^{\underline{\omega}}_m(x) > m) = (\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})(M_m \le u_m) \tag{5.14}$$

Let us write the measure on the left-hand side of (5.14) in terms of integrals: it is given by

$$\iint_{\{r^{\underline{\omega}}_m > m\}} \mathrm{d}(\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}) = \iint h_\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(x) \mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_1} x) \cdots \mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1} x) \, \mathrm{dLeb} \, \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \tag{5.15}$$

which is in turn equal to

$$\int_M \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^m_{\varepsilon,m} h_\varepsilon(x) \, \mathrm{dLeb} \tag{5.16}$$

where we have now defined

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m} \psi(x) := \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c} \psi)(x) \tag{5.17}$$

Let us note that the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ depends on m via the set U_m, and not on ε which is kept fixed and that $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ "reduces" to $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ as $m \to \infty$. It is therefore tempting to consider $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ as a small perturbation of $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ when m is large and to check if it shares the spectral properties of a REPFO operator. We will show in a moment that it will be the case; let us now see what it implies for our theory.

5.2. **Limiting distributions.** We now indicate the correspondences between the general notations of Keller's results and our own quantities:

$$P_0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$$
$$P_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m};\ Q_\varepsilon \Rightarrow Q_{\varepsilon,m}$$
$$\varphi_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \varphi_{\varepsilon,m};\ \varphi_0 \Rightarrow h_\varepsilon$$
$$\lambda_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \lambda_{\varepsilon,m}$$
$$\nu_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \nu_{\varepsilon,m};\ \nu_0 \Rightarrow \text{Leb}$$
$$\Delta_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \Delta_{\varepsilon,m} = \mu_\varepsilon(U_m) = \text{Leb}((\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})h_\varepsilon)$$

The framework for which we will prove the assumptions **(A1)-(A4)** for our REPFO $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ are those behind the system and its perturbations which we introduced in the previous sections and which we summarize here:

Hypotheses on the system and its perturbations

We consider piecewise expanding maps f of the circle or of the interval I which verify:

H1 The map f admits a (unique) a.c.i.p. which is mixing.

H2 We perturb f with additive noise and we write f_ω for the family of perturbed maps. We will require that

$$\inf_{\omega, x\in I} |Df_\omega(x)| \geq \beta > 1. \tag{5.18}$$

and

$$\sup_{\omega, x\in I} \left| \frac{D^2 f_\omega(x)}{Df_\omega(x)} \right| \leq C_1 < \infty, \tag{5.19}$$

whenever the first and the second derivatives are defined.

H3 The couple of adapted spaces upon which the REPFO operators will act are: the space of functions of bounded variation (as in Definition 3.1, we will indicate with Var the total variation), and $L^1(\text{Leb})$, with norm $\|\cdot\|_1$; this time, we will write $\|\cdot\|_{BV} = \text{Var}(\cdot) + \|\cdot\|_1$ for the associated Banach norm.

H4 There exists a monotone upper semi-continuous function $p : \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} p_\varepsilon = 0$ and $\forall f \in \text{BV}, \forall \varepsilon \in \Omega : ||\mathcal{P}f - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon f||_1 \leq p_\varepsilon ||f||_{BV}$[3].

H5 The density h_ε of the stationary measure is bounded from below Leb-a.e. and we call this bound $\underline{h}_\varepsilon$.

---

[3] This condition can be checked in several cases. We did it, for instance, in the previous section 4.2.2. A general theorem is presented in [BY93, Lemma 8] for piecewise expanding maps of the interval endowed with our pair of adapted spaces and with the noise given by a convolution kernel. This means that θ_ε is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue on the space Ω with density s_ε, and our two operators are related by the convolution formula $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon g(x) = \int_\Omega (\mathcal{P}g)(x-\omega)s_\varepsilon(\omega)\mathrm{d}\omega$, where $g \in BV$. In the case of additive noise, it is straightforward to check that the previous formula is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon g(x) = \int_\Omega (\mathcal{P}_\omega g)(x)s_\varepsilon(\omega)\mathrm{d}\omega$, where $\mathcal{P}_\omega$ is the Perron-Frobenius operator of the transformation f_ω.

Extreme values
Let us therefore write $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}\varphi_{\varepsilon,m} = \lambda_{\varepsilon,m}\varphi_{\varepsilon,m}$, $\nu_{\varepsilon,m}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m} = \lambda_{\varepsilon,m}\nu_{\varepsilon,m}$, and $\lambda_{\varepsilon,m}^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m} = \varphi_{\varepsilon,m} \otimes \nu_{\varepsilon,m} + Q_{\varepsilon,m}$.

Then formula (5.7) implies that $1 - \lambda_{\varepsilon,m} = \Delta_{\varepsilon,m}\vartheta_\varepsilon(1 + o(1))$. We can therefore write:

$$\begin{aligned}(\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})(M_m \le u_m) &= \int_M \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^m_{\varepsilon,m} h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb} = \lambda^m_{\varepsilon,m}\int h_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{\varepsilon,m} + \lambda^m_{\varepsilon,m}\int Q_{\varepsilon,m}h_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{dLeb}\\ &= e^{-(\vartheta_\varepsilon m\,\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)+m\,o(\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)))}\int h_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{\varepsilon,m} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^m_{\varepsilon,m}\left\|Q_{\varepsilon,m}\right\|_{BV})\end{aligned}$$

Remember that we are under the assumption that $m\,(\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})(\phi > u_m) = m\,\mu_\varepsilon(\phi > u_m) = m\,\mu_\varepsilon(U_m) \to \tau$, when $m \to \infty$; moreover it follows from the theory of [KL09] that $\int h_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{\varepsilon,m} \to \int h_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{dLeb} = 1$, as m goes to infinity. In conclusion we get

$$(\mu_\varepsilon \text{ x } \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})(M_m \le u_m) = e^{-\tau\vartheta_\varepsilon}(1 + o(1))$$

in the limit $m \to \infty$ and where ϑ_ε will be the extremal index and this will be explicitly computed later on for some particular maps thanks to formula (5.9) and shown to be equal to 1 for any point ζ, see Proposition 5.3 below.

Random hitting times
Let us denote again with $r^{\omega}_{U_m}(x)$ the first entrance into the ball U_m. A direct application of [K12, Proposition 2] and which is true for REPFO operators, allows to get the following result, which we adapted to our situation and which provides an explicit formula for the statistics of the first hitting times in the annealed case. Notice that this result strenghtens our Corollary D since it provides the error in the convergence to the exponential law.

Proposition 5.1. *For the REPFO* $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ *which verifies the hypotheses* **H1**-**H5***, and using the notations introduced above, there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* m *big enough there exists* $\xi_m > 0$ *s.t. for all* $t > 0$

$$\left|(\mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}})\left\{r^{\omega}_{U_m} > \frac{t}{\xi_m\,\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)}\right\} - e^{-t}\right| \le C\delta_m(t \vee 1)e^{-t}$$

where $\delta_m = O(\eta_m \log \eta_m)$*, being*

$$\eta_m = \sup\left\{\int_{U_m} \psi\,\mathrm{dLeb};\, \|\psi\| \le 1\right\}$$

and ξ_m *goes to* ϑ_ε *as* $m \to \infty$*.*

5.3. Cheking assumptions (A1)-(A4).

Proposition 5.2. *For the REPFO* $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$ *which verifies the hypotheses* **H1**-**H5***, the assumptions* **(A1)**-**(A4)** *hold.*

Proof. Condition (**A1**) means to prove the Lasota-Yorke inequality for the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$. We begin with the total variation.

The structure of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$'s iterates is

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^n_{\varepsilon,m}\psi) = \int\cdots\int \mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\mathcal{P}_{\omega_{n-1}}(\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\cdots\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(\psi\,\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m})))\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega_1)\cdots\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega_n). \tag{5.20}$$

Let us call A_{l,ω_j} the l-domain of injectivity of the map f_{ω_j} and call f^{-1}_{l,ω_j} the inverse of f_{ω_j} restricted to A_{l,ω_j}. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} &:= \mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\mathcal{P}_{\omega_{n-1}}(\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\cdots\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(\psi\,\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m})))(x)\\ &= \sum_{k_n,\dots,k_1}\frac{(\psi\cdot\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\circ f_{\omega_1}\cdots\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}f_{\omega_{n-1}}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))}{|D(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))|}\\ &\qquad\qquad\times\mathbf{1}_{f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(x)\end{aligned}$$

The sets

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} := f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_{n-1},\omega_{n-1}}A_{k_n,\omega_n}\cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_{n-2},\omega_{n-2}}A_{k_{n-1},\omega_{n-1}}\cap\cdots\\ \cdots\cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}A_{k_2,\omega_2}\cap A_{k_1,\omega_1}\end{aligned}$$

are intervals and they give a mod-0 partition of $I=[0,1]$; moreover the image $H^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} := f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}$ for a given n-tuple $\{k_n,\dots,k_1\}$ is a connected interval. We also note for future purposes that we could equivalently write:

$$g_n := \mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\circ f_{\omega_1}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}\circ\cdots\circ\mathbf{1}_{U^c_m}f_{\omega_{n-1}}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1} = \mathbf{1}_{U^c_m\cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}U^c_m\cap\cdots\cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{\omega_{n-1}}U^c_m}$$

Now we observe that the set

$$U^c_m(n) := U^c_m\cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}U^c_m\cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}\circ f^{-1}_{\omega_2}U^c_m\cap\cdots\cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{\omega_{n-1}}U^c_m\cap\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}$$

is actually given by:

$$U^c_m(n) := U^c_m\cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}U^c_m\cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ f^{-1}_{k_2,\omega_2}U^c_m\cap\cdots\cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_{n-1},\omega_{n-1}}U^c_m\cap\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}$$

Since U^c_m is the disjoint union of two connected intervals, the number of connected intervals in $U^c_m(n)$ is bounded from above by $n+1$ and it is important that it grows linearly with n. We now take the total variation $\mathrm{Var}(\Upsilon_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})$. We begin to remark that, by standard techniques:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{(\psi g_n)((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))}{|D(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))|}\mathbf{1}_{f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(x)\right)\\ &\qquad\le 2\mathrm{Var}_{H^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}\left(\frac{(\psi g_n)((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))}{|D(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})((f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1}\circ\cdots\circ f^{-1}_{k_n,\omega_n})(x))|}\right)\\ &\qquad\qquad+\frac{2}{\beta^n}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Leb}(\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})}\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}|\psi g_n|\,\mathrm{dLeb}\end{aligned}$$

where β is given by (5.18) in **H2**.
The variation above could be continued as, still by standard techniques:

$$\leq \frac{2}{\beta^n}\mathrm{Var}_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(\psi g_n) + \frac{2}{\beta^n}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Leb}(\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})}\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi g_n| \,\mathrm{dLeb}$$
$$+ 2\sup_{\zeta,\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} \frac{|D^2(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})(\zeta)|}{[D(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})(\zeta)]^2}\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi g_n| \,\mathrm{dLeb} \quad (5.21)$$

We now have:

$$\frac{|D^2(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})(\zeta)|}{[D(f_{\omega_n}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1})(\zeta)]^2} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{D^2 f_{\omega_{n-k}}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{n-1-k} T_{\omega_{n-l}}(\zeta)\right)}{\left[Df_{\omega_{n-k}}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{n-1-k} f_{\omega_{n-l}}(\zeta)\right)\right]^2 \prod_{j=0}^{k} Df_{\omega_{n-j+1}}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{n-j} f_{\omega_{n-l}}(\zeta)\right)}$$

Since by (5.19) in **H2** we have

$$\sup_{\omega, x\in A_{k,\omega}} \left|\frac{D^2 f_\omega(x)}{Df_\omega(x)}\right| \leq C_1 < \infty,$$

and using again (5.18), the previous sum will be bounded by C_1 times the sum of a geometric series of reason β^{-1}: we call C the upper bound thus found. Our variation above is therefore bounded by:

$$(5.21) \leq \frac{2}{\beta^n}\mathrm{Var}_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(\psi g_n) + \frac{2}{\beta^n}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Leb}(\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})}\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi g_n| \mathrm{dLeb} + 2C\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi g_n| \mathrm{dLeb} \quad (5.22)$$

Now:

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(\psi g_n) \leq \mathrm{Var}_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}}(\psi) + 2(n+1)\sup_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi|$$
$$\leq [2(n+1)+1]\mathrm{Var}_{\Omega_n}(\psi) + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Leb}(\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})}\int_{\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}} |\psi| \,\mathrm{dLeb} \quad (5.23)$$

where $2(n+1)$ is an estimate from above of the number of jumps of g_n. We now observe that for a finite realization of length $n, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$, the quantity $\Psi_{n,\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} = \inf_{k_1,\dots,k_n} \mathrm{Leb}(\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n})$, where each k_j runs over the finite branches of f_{ω_j}, is surely strictly positive. We moreover suppose that

$$\Psi_n := \int \Psi_{n,\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} \mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} > 0, \ (*)$$

We now replace (5.23) into (5.22), we sum over the $k_1, \dots, k_n$ and we integrate w.r.t. $\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$; finally we get

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^n_{\varepsilon,m}\psi) \leq \frac{2}{\beta^n}(2n+3)\mathrm{Var}(\psi) + [\frac{4}{\beta^n}\frac{1}{\Psi_n} + 2C]\int_I |\psi| \,\mathrm{dLeb}$$

In order to get the Lasota-Yorke inequality one should get a certain n_0 and a number $\beta > \kappa > 1$ and such that

$$\frac{2}{\beta^{n_0}}(2n_0+3) < \kappa^{-n_0} \tag{5.24}$$

and still suppose that $\Psi_{n_0} > 0$; the Lasota-Yorke inequality (5.10) will then follow with standard arguments [4]

We now compute the L^1-norm of our operator. We have to compute $\|\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^n_{\varepsilon,m}\psi\|_1$; by splitting f into the sum of its positive and negative parts and by using the linearity of the transfer operator, we could suppose that f is non-negative. This allows us to interchange the integrals w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure and $\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ and to use duality for each of the $\mathcal{P}_\omega$. In conclusion we get

$$\|\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^n_{\varepsilon,m}\psi\|_1 \leq \int |\psi| h_\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(x)\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_1}x)\cdots\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_{n-1}}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}x)\,\mathrm{dLeb} \leq \|\psi\|_1.$$

This concludes the proof of the Lasota-Yorke inequality, (**A1**). We will give the proof of the (strict) positivity of Ψ_n at the end. Besides the latter, the uniformity w.r.t. the noise comes from the assumptions on the uniform bound from below for the first derivative and the uniform bound from above for the second derivative. With these two assumptions it is straightforward to get the Lasota-Yorke inequality with the *same* factors A and B for the operator $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ (the unperturbed operator w.r.t. $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}$), and for the Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{P}$ of the original map f (the unperturbed operator w.r.t. $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$). But the latter is a mixing operator (1 is the only eigenvalue of finite multiplicity on the unit circle), since our original map f was chosen to be mixing (hypothesis **H1**), and therefore, by the perturbation theory in [KL09] and the closeness of the two operators expressed by assumption **H4**, also $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ is a mixing operator and this proves (**A2**). Let us discuss the assumption (**A3**).
We have to bound the following quantity, for any f of bounded variation and of total variation less than or equal to 1:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_I (\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}\psi(x) - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon\psi(x))\,\mathrm{dLeb}(x)\right| &= \left|\int_I \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{1}_{U_m}\psi)(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}(x)\right| \\ &\leq \left|\int\left(\int_I \mathcal{P}_\omega(\mathbf{1}_{U_m}\psi)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\right)\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(\omega)\right| \leq \|\psi\|_\infty\ \mathrm{Leb}(U_m)\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\psi\|_\infty \leq \|\psi\|_{BV}$ and $\mathrm{Leb}(U_m)$ goes to zero when m goes to infinity.

We now check assumption (**A4**) under the hypothesis **H5**.
We have:

$$\|(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m} - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon)h_\varepsilon\|_{BV} = \|\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{1}_{U_m}h_\varepsilon)\|_{BV} \leq A\kappa^{-1}\|\mathbf{1}_{U_m}h_\varepsilon\|_{BV} + B\|\mathbf{1}_{U_m}h_\varepsilon\|_1$$

---

[4] By defining $A = 2(2n_0+3)$ and $B = \left[\frac{4}{\Psi_{n_0}} + 2C\right]\frac{2}{1-\kappa^{-n_0}}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^n_{\varepsilon,m}\psi) \leq A\kappa^{-n}\mathrm{Var}(\psi) + B\int_I |\psi|\,\mathrm{dLeb}.$$

The left hand side is bounded by a constant C^* which is independent of m. We remind that in our case $\Delta_{\varepsilon,m} = \mu_\varepsilon(U_m)$ and that

$$\eta_{\varepsilon,m} := \sup_{\|\psi\|_{BV}\leq 1} \left| \int_I (\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m}\psi(x) - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon\psi(x))\,\mathrm{dLeb}(x) \right| \leq \mathrm{Leb}(U_m)$$

(see computation above). Then

$$\|(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m} - \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon)h_\varepsilon\|_{BV} \leq C^* \frac{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)}{\underline{h}_\varepsilon \mathrm{Leb}(U_m)} \leq C^* \frac{\Delta_{\varepsilon,m}}{\eta_{\varepsilon,m}}$$

We are now left with the condition on Ψ_n. We remind that we are considering additive noise and this will be useful in two main cases considered in this paper.

(i) *Continuous expanding maps of the circle.* In this case, if we call $A_{k,0}$ the domains of injectivity of the unperturbed map f, these domains persist as domains of injectivity for any of the translated maps $f_\omega = f + \omega \mod 1$ and we could use them to compute the Perron-Frobenius operators $\mathcal{P}_\omega$. More importantly, each f_ω is onto on each of these domains. This implies that iterating forward $n-1$ times the interval $\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{\omega_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1} \Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n} = \\ &\quad f_{\omega_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1} (f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1} \circ \cdots \circ f^{-1}_{k_{n-1},\omega_{n-1}} A_{k_n,\omega_n} \cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1} \circ \cdots \circ f^{-1}_{k_{n-2},\omega_{n-2}} A_{k_{n-1},\omega_{n-1}} \cap \cdots \\ &\qquad\qquad \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{k_1,\omega_1} A_{k_2,\omega_2} \cap A_{k_1,\omega_1}), \end{aligned}$$

we get exactly A_{k_n,ω_n}. If for a fixed n we could find a finite realization $(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n)$ for which the diameter of $\Omega^{k_1,\dots,k_n}_{\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n}$ is arbitrarily small we could never expand it with a factor β at each step of the iteration in order to get the length of A_{k_n,ω_n}.

(ii) *Piecewise expanding maps of the intervals.* Suppose we perturb the map with additive noise; to simplify the argument we want to compare, when $n = 3$ the two sequences $A_1 \cap f^{-1}A_2 \cap f^{-2}A_3$ (supposedly non-empty), with $A_1 \cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}A_2 \cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}f^{-1}_{\omega_2}A_3$. If ε is the maximum translation of the perturbed map, the maximum loss of mass between the diameters of the sets $A_2 \cap f^{-1}A_3$ and $A_2 \cap f^{-1}_{\omega_2}A_3$ will occur when, for instance, $f(A_2) \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$ and $f_{\omega_2}(A_2) \cap A_3 = \emptyset$, and it will be at most $\beta^{-1}\varepsilon$. At the next step, when we compare $A_1 \cap f^{-1}(A_2 \cap f^{-1}A_3)$ with $A_1 \cap f^{-1}_{\omega_1}(A_2 \cap f^{-1}_{\omega_2}A_3)$, the loss of mass increases at $2\beta^{-1}\varepsilon$. By induction we see that after n steps the difference of mass between the cylinders of the original map and those of a given realization of lenght n amounts to $n\beta^{-1}\varepsilon$. If l_n is the minimum length of the cylinders of order n of the original map, it would be enough to choose ε small enough such that, for instance, $l_n - n\beta^{-1}\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}l_n$, namely $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}\frac{\log n}{n}\beta$: remember that n is actually here n_0 given by the inequality (5.24). □

5.4. **Extremal index.** In this part, we investigate the quantity, see (5.8) and (5.9):

$$q_{k,m} = \frac{\mathrm{Leb}((\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^k_{\varepsilon,m}(\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})(h_\varepsilon))}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)}$$

We recall that $U_m := U_m(\zeta)$ represents a ball around the point ζ. Our result is the following.

Proposition 5.3. *Let us suppose that f is either a C^2 expanding map of the circle or a piecewise expanding map of the circle with finite branches and verifying hypotheses* **H1**-**H4**. *Then*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} q_{k,m} \equiv q_k$$

exists and is equal to zero, $q_k = 0, \forall k$, and the extremal index verifies $\vartheta = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_k = 1$ and this is independent of the point ζ, the center of the ball U_m.

Proof. Let us define $G_{k,m} \equiv \int (\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^k_{\varepsilon,m}(\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})h_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{dLeb}$.

As $(\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})\psi = \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{1}_{U_m}\psi)$, we may write $G_{k,m} = \int \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x)\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^k_{\varepsilon,m}(\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\varepsilon,m})h_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{dLeb}$. By using (5.20) we get

$$G_{k,m} = \iint \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(f_{\omega_{k+1}}\circ f_{\omega_k}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}x)\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_k}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}x)\ldots\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_1}x)\mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x)h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

In order to simplify the notation let us put

$$\psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) = \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(f_{\omega_{k+1}}\circ f_{\omega_k}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}x)\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_k}\circ\cdots\circ f_{\omega_1}x)\ldots\mathbf{1}_{U_m^c}(f_{\omega_1}x)\mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x).$$

Now let us prove that $q_{k,m}$ converges to 0. Our approach is going to be very similar to what we did to prove $D'(u_m)$ and we now split the proof according to the regularity of the map.

(i) Suppose that $f : \mathcal{S}^1 \to \mathcal{S}^1$ is a C^2, expanding map, *i.e.*, there exists $|Df(x)| > \lambda > 1$, for all $x \in \mathcal{S}^1$. First, note that since S^1 is compact and f is C^2, there exists $\sigma > 1$ such that $|Df(x)| \le \sigma$. Hence the set U_m grows at most at a rate given by σ, so, for any $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have $|f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(U_m)| \le \sigma^j|U_m|$. This implies that

$$\text{if } \operatorname{dist}(f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta),\zeta) > 2\sigma^j|U_m| > |U_m| + \sigma^j|U_m| \text{ then } f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(U_m)\cap U_m = \emptyset. \tag{5.25}$$

Note that, by inequality (5.25), if for all $j = 1,\ldots,k+1$ we have $\operatorname{dist}(f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta),\zeta) > 2\sigma^j|U_m|$, then clearly $\psi_{k,B_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) = 0$, for all x. We define

$$W_{k,m} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{k+1}\{\underline{\omega} \in (-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}} : \operatorname{dist}(f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta),\zeta) > 2\sigma^j|U_m|\} \tag{5.26}$$

Note that on $W_{k,m}$ we have $\psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}} = 0$. We want to compute the measure of $W^c_{k,m}$.

Observe that $W_{k,m}^c \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{k+1}\{\underline{\omega}:\ f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(\zeta)\in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\zeta)\}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(W_{k,m}^c) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right)+\omega_j\in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\zeta)\})\\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : \omega_j\in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\zeta)-f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right)\})\\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\int_{B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\zeta)-f\left(f_{\underline{\omega}}^{j-1}(\zeta)\right)} g_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\overline{g_\varepsilon}\left|B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\zeta)\right| = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\overline{g_\varepsilon}4\sigma^j|U_m|\\
&\leq 4\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{k,m} &= \int_{W_{k,m}}\int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x)h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} + \int_{W_{k,m}^c}\int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x)h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}\\
&= 0+\int_{W_{k,m}^c}\int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x)h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \quad \text{and because } \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x)\leq \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x)\text{, we have:}\\
&\leq \int_{W_{k,m}^c}\int \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x)h_\varepsilon(x)\,\mathrm{dLeb}\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \leq \mu_\varepsilon(U_m)\,\theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(W_{k,m}^c)\\
&\leq \mu_\varepsilon(U_m)4\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Now recall that $q_{k,m}=\frac{G_{k,m}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)}$. It follows that

$$q_{k,m}\leq \frac{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)4\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)} \leq 4\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}\xrightarrow[m\to\infty]{} 0.$$

(ii) Using the same ideas as in the previous section, we can extend this result to the piecewise expanding maps with finite branches. Recall that we need to define some safety boxes in order to use the same arguments as in the continuous case. So, if for all $j=1,\dots,k+1$ and $i=1,\dots,\ell$, where ℓ stands for the number of discontinuity points, we have

$$\mathrm{dist}(f_{\underline{\omega}}^j(\zeta),\xi_i)>2\sigma^j|U_m|, \tag{5.27}$$

then the set U_m consists of one connected component at each iteration, and also we have $f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(U_m) \cap U_m = \emptyset$ which means $\psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) = 0$, for all x. Now let us define

$$W_{k,m} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{k+1} \bigcap_{i=0}^{\ell} \{\underline{\omega} \in (-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}} : \operatorname{dist}(f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta), \xi_i) > 2\sigma^j |U_m|\}. \tag{5.28}$$

Observe that in this case

$$W^c_{k,m} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{k+1} \bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} \{\underline{\omega} :\ f^j_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta) \in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\xi_i)\}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon(W^c_{k,m}) &\le \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right) + \omega_j \in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\xi_i)\}) \\
&\le \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \theta_\varepsilon(\{\omega_j : \omega_j \in B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\xi_i) - f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right)\}) \\
&\le \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \int_{B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\xi_i) - f\left(f^{j-1}_{\underline{\omega}}(\zeta)\right)} g_\varepsilon(x)dx \\
&\le \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \overline{g_\varepsilon} \left|B_{2\sigma^j|U_m|}(\xi_i)\right| = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \overline{g_\varepsilon} 4\sigma^j |U_m| \\
&\le 4(\ell+1)\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{k,m} &= \int_{W_{k,m}} \int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) h_\varepsilon(x)\, \mathrm{dLeb}\, \mathrm{d}\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon + \int_{W^c_{k,m}} \int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) h_\varepsilon(x)\, \mathrm{dLeb}\, \mathrm{d}\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon \\
&= 0 + \int_{W^c_{k,m}} \int \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) h_\varepsilon(x)\, \mathrm{dLeb}\, \mathrm{d}\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon \quad \text{and because } \psi_{k,U_m,\underline{\omega}}(x) \le \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x)\text{, we have:} \\
&\le \int_{W^c_{k,m}} \int \mathbf{1}_{U_m}(x) h_\varepsilon(x)\, \mathrm{dLeb}\, \mathrm{d}\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon \le \mu_\varepsilon(U_m)\theta^{\mathbb{N}}_\varepsilon(W^c_{k,m}) \\
&\le \mu_\varepsilon(U_m) 4(\ell+1)\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $q_{k,m} = \frac{G_{k,m}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)}$, we get

$$q_{k,m} \le \frac{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)4(\ell+1)\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_m)} \le 4(\ell+1)\overline{g_\varepsilon}|U_m|\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\sigma^{k+1} \xrightarrow[m\to\infty]{} 0.$$

□

Remark 5.1. Let us note that $D'(u_m)$ implies that all q_k's are well defined and equal to 0. Assume that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subsequence $(m_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{G_{k,m_j}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_{m_j})} = \alpha > 0$. Let us prove that $D'(u_m)$ does not hold in this situation. Recall that if $D'(u_m)$ holds then

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} m \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor m/k_m \rfloor} \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(X_0 > u_m, X_j > u_m) = 0,$$

where k_m (which should not be confused with k, here) is a sequence diverging to ∞ but slower than m, which implies that $\lfloor m/k_m \rfloor \to \infty$, as $m \to \infty$. Hence, let M_0 be sufficiently large so that for all $m > M_0$ we have $\lfloor m/k_m \rfloor > k$. Hence, for i sufficiently large so that $m_i > M_0$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor m_i/k_{m_i} \rfloor} \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(X_0 > u_{m_i}, X_j > u_{m_i}) &\geq m_i\, \mu_\varepsilon \times \theta_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}(X_0 > u_{m_i}, X_{k+1} > u_{m_i}) \\ &\geq m_i\, G_{k,m_i} \sim \frac{\tau\, G_{k,m_i}}{\mu_\varepsilon(U_{m_i})} \to \tau\alpha > 0, \text{ as } i \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since B_m is such that $m\mu_\varepsilon(U_m) \to \tau$, as $m \to \infty$. This implies that $D'(u_m)$ does not hold.

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank Ian Melbourne for helpful comments and, in particular, for calling us the attention for the paper [D98]. We are grateful to Wael Bahsoun and Manuel Stadlbauer for fruitful conversations and comments.

REFERENCES

[AA03] J. F. Alves and V. Araújo, *Random perturbations of nonuniformly expanding maps*, Astérisque (2003), no. 286, xvii, 25–62, geometric methods in dynamics. I. 1

[AFL11] J. F. Alves, J. M. Freitas, S. Luzzatto, and S. Vaienti, *From rates of mixing to recurrence times via large deviations*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 2, 1203–1236. 1, 2.3, 3.2.2

[BBM02] V. Baladi, M. Benedicks, and V. Maume-Deschamps, *Almost sure rates of mixing for i.i.d. unimodal maps*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **35** (2002), no. 1, 77–126. 1

[BBM03] V. Baladi, M. Benedicks, and V. Maume-Deschamps, *Corrigendum: "Almost sure rates of mixing for i.i.d. unimodal maps" [Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **35** *(2002), no. 1, 77–126; MR1886006 (2003d:37027)]*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **36** (2003), no. 2, 319–322. 1

[BY93] V. Baladi and L.-S. Young, *On the spectra of randomly perturbed expanding maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **156** (1993), no. 2, 355–385. 3

[C01] P. Collet, *Statistics of closest return for some non-uniformly hyperbolic systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), no. 2, 401–420. 3.1

[D98] D. Dolgopyat, *On decay of correlations in Anosov flows*, Ann. of Math. (2) **147** (1998), no. 2, 357–390. 1, 5.4

[FP12] A. Ferguson and M. Pollicott, *Escape rates for gibbs measures*, Ergod. Theory Dynam. Systems **32** (2012), 961–988. 3.2

[FF08a] A. C. M. Freitas and J. M. Freitas, *On the link between dependence and independence in extreme value theory for dynamical systems*, Statist. Probab. Lett. **78** (2008), no. 9, 1088–1093. 2, 3.1

[FFT10a] A. C. M. Freitas, J. M. Freitas, and M. Todd, *Extremal index, hitting time statistics and periodicity*, Preprint arXiv:1008.1350v1 (2010). 1, 3.2, 3.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3, 3.3, 3.3

[FFT10] A. C. M. Freitas, J. M. Freitas, and M. Todd, *Hitting time statistics and extreme value theory*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **147** (2010), no. 3, 675–710. 1, 2, 3.1

[FFT11] A. C. M. Freitas, J. M. Freitas, and M. Todd, *Extreme value laws in dynamical systems for non-smooth observations*, J. Stat. Phys. **142** (2011), 108–126, 10.1007/s10955-010-0096-4. 1, 2, 3.2

[HLV05] N. Haydn, Y. Lacroix, and S. Vaienti, *Hitting and return times in ergodic dynamical systems*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), no. 5, 2043–2050. 2

[K12] G. Keller, *Rare events, exponential hitting times and extremal indices via spectral perturbationâ*, Dynamical Systems **27** (2012), no. 1, 11–27. 1, 3.2, 5, 5.1, 5.1, 5.1, 5.2

[KL09] G. Keller and C. Liverani, *Rare events, escape rates and quasistationarity: some exact formulae*, J. Stat. Phys. **135** (2009), no. 3, 519–534. 1, 4.2.2, 5, 5.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3

[K86a] Y. Kifer, Ergodic theory of random transformations, *Progress in Probability and Statistics*, volume 10, Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston Inc. (1986). 1

[KL06] Y. Kifer and P.-D. Liu, *Random dynamics*, in Handbook of dynamical systems. Vol. 1B, Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam (2006), 379–499. 1

[MR11] P. Marie and J. Rousseau, *Recurrence for random dynamical systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **30** (2011), no. 1, 1–16. 1, 2

[R83] M. Rychlik, *Bounded variation and invariant measures*, Studia Math. **76** (1983), no. 1, 69–80. 3.2.1, 3.2.1

[S00] B. Saussol, *Absolutely continuous invariant measures for multidimensional expanding maps*, Israel J. Math. **116** (2000), 223–248. 3.2.2, 3.2.2, 3.2.2, 4.2.2

[S09] B. Saussol, *An introduction to quantitative Poincaré recurrence in dynamical systems*, Rev. Math. Phys. **21** (2009), no. 8, 949–979. 1

[V97] M. Viana, *Stochastic dynamics of deterministic systems*, Brazillian Math. Colloquium 1997, IMPA. (1997). 4.2.1

Hale Aytaç, Centro de Matemática da Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal

E-mail address: `aytach@fc.up.pt`

Jorge Milhazes Freitas, Centro de Matemática & Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal

E-mail address: `jmfreita@fc.up.pt`

URL: `http://www.fc.up.pt/pessoas/jmfreita`

Sandro Vaienti, (Temporary address) Centro de Modelamiento Matemático, Av. Blanco Encalada 2120 Piso 7, Santiago de Chile. (On leave from/Permanent address) UMR-7332 Centre de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Université d'Aix-Marseille, Université du Sud, Toulon-Var and FRUMAM, Fédération de Recherche des Unités des Mathématiques de Marseille, CPT Luminy, Case 907, F-13288 Marseille CEDEX 9

E-mail address: `vaienti@cpt.univ-mrs.fr`